

THE
P A P E R S

READ BEFORE THE

American Institute of Instruction,

AT

WORCESTER, MASS., AUGUST, 1870.

WITH THE

JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS,

INCLUDING

The Constitution.

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

BOSTON:
AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION.
1870.

LZ 13
A51
1870

37A2 0110

A. MUDGE & SON, Printers, 34 School street, Boston.

YT1293V100

CONTENTS.

ADDRESS OF MAYOR BLAKE.....	5
ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT GREENE.....	9
THE DUTY OF TOWNS TO SUPPORT EVENING SCHOOLS: A Paper read by Rev. A. A. Miner, D. D.....	21
DISCUSSION of the same.....	30
THE PLACE AND WORK OF ACADEMIES IN OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM: A paper read by Rev. J. B. Dow.....	37
DISCUSSION of the same.....	49
DISCUSSION: "The Bible in Common Schools"	57
DISCUSSION: "A General Course of Study"	76
LIST OF OFFICERS.....	90
COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE: A Paper read by Hon. Joseph White.....	92
GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	98
THE BIBLE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A Paper read by Rev. Andrew P. Peabody, D. D.....	101
CONSTITUTION	127

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION.

FORTY-FIRST ANNUAL MEETING.

FIRST DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

WORCESTER, MASS., July 27, 1870.

THE American Institute of Instruction commenced the sessions of its forty-first annual meeting at Mechanics Hall, in Worcester, at eleven o'clock, A. M. The chair was occupied by the President, Prof. S. S. Greene, of Brown University, who called on the Rev. T. E. St. John to open the exercises with prayer.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME.

The Institute was welcomed to the city by His Honor, Mayor Blake, as follows: —

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: — It is with more than ordinary feelings of emotion that I rise to occupy a brief moment of your time before the formal business of the occasion shall summon your attention, to utter a word of cordial greeting and of heartfelt sympathy in behalf of this community whom I have the honor to represent. It is peculiarly gratifying to present to you the words of welcome in behalf of a people who are so thoroughly interested and keenly alive to every sentiment pertaining to the great subject-matter of the special labor which has brought you hither from distant homes for comparative consultation and earnest advisement; a people who have aimed to place the school system of their municipality in the foreground of the age, and who with interest

unabated, and liberality unparalleled in our local history, are doing everything to establish, maintain, and perpetuate this most beneficent enterprise of free education, which has added so much to the renown of our ancient Commonwealth.

As I appreciate the presence of those who have devoted a life's work to the great principle of education,—that education which embraces the universal means by which Providence is guiding the human race to its final destiny,—I also recognize here those who by direct instruction are transmitting and interpreting to the new generation the experiences of the race; a means by which alone the present is put in possession of all the attainments of preceding generations, and through which it is to become capable of increasing and improving the inheritance.

Assembling as you do to-day in this central city of Massachusetts, representatives of the educational interests of our country, we can hardly fail to appreciate the magnitude of the inheritance which has come down to us through the passing time; the accumulative knowledge and experience and history of all the past; the embodiment of the wisdom of the ages; and, as by retrospective glance we consider the development of man's higher powers, from the Chinese sage, Confucius, five hundred years before the Christian era, we cannot but recall by progressive steps the development of that highly intellectual and æsthetic culture which gave birth to Athenian education through the lives of Solon and Pericles and Plutarch; the prominent position given to the science of mathematics by the Greek philosopher Pythagoras; the efforts of Socrates and Plato and Aristotle, through whom the higher departments of philosophy and

polity were developed ; remembering, also, the labors of Alfred and Luther and Melancthon, and the later Italian, German, and English friends of education, we cannot forget the developed mind of our own time in the persons of those who have given form and direction to the educational interests of this State and of this nation, by whose efforts knowledge has been transferred from the ascetics' cloisters, and the enjoyment of the favored few, to the free air of heaven, to be absorbed by all, through whom the doors of learning are invitingly opened to the humblest child in our midst ; by whom the universality of free schools has been established. And you will join me in the sentiment that the names of Mann and Barnard, of Wayland and Sears, of Emerson and Greene, and other pioneers of free education, will not only be remembered and cherished by the sons of New England, but will ever form a constellation more beautiful than Athenian design, more permanent than Greek mythology — immortal in the history of our country and the hearts of American citizens.

And with all this accumulated knowledge of the past, the wisdom of the centuries, how great the inheritance, how important the duty, how sacred is the trust imposed upon the profession so largely represented here ; the means by which so much is to be absorbed and analyzed and retained ; the avenue through which so much must be faithfully transmitted to the coming generations.

The gathered harvests of the world's knowledge are at your disposal, and as education must ever be the foundation principle and the corner-stone of our system of government, the seeds of republican liberty and national unity are to be sown by you. Never was there so promising a field for your noble labor, never an era in

the history of man so propitious for your grand work; settled organization the policy of the country, freedom made national, and millions of minds, representing all nationalities, waiting for development at your hands. Never an age so profound in thought, so earnest in spirit, so rich in its discoveries of truth, so grand in its triumphs over nature, so Christ-like in its efforts to uplift and bless humanity.

In the full appreciation, therefore, of your responsibilities and the magnitude of your mission as representing the educational interest of our whole people through the medium of free schools, we feel that no organized body throughout the land, no meeting of citizens, no concentration of mental power, has or can have a more important work intrusted to them than that which is now committed to your keeping; humble, perhaps, in origin, yet gigantic in power; voluntary in assumption, but infinite in conception; local in its early history, yet boundless in its development: a little seed sown in Massachusetts soil scarce half a century ago, to be gathered in the harvest of a continent; the child of New England to become through your well-directed efforts the saviour of republican American government.

In this true spirit of co-operation and interest, my friends, would I welcome you to this city of Worcester, which will ever heartily respond to every demand for the advancement of education among the people of this land, and whose voice has so recently been heard in the halls of Congress, as their representative with equal force and ability demands in their behalf that universal education shall be made a "National concern and National necessity."

Welcome to the hospitalities of our citizens, who

would bid you God speed in the noble works of your hands; and through the blessings of Providence may this and succeeding generations, through the whole breadth of our land, witness, as the perennial fruit of the labors of this American Institute of Instruction, the ripened and ever-ripening sheaves of religion and morality, of culture and loyalty, of developed intellect and educated mind, which shall give to our whole people the true source and only power of self-government, furnish the foundation of our national strength, and thus guarantee forever the perpetuity of this American Republic !

RESPONSE BY THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. Mayor :—It becomes my agreeable duty to acknowledge with gratitude the obligations of the American Institute of Instruction for the eloquent words of welcome with which we are greeted on this occasion. We are in the heart of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ; truly in the heart ; and the heart of this noble Commonwealth has spoken to us this morning. We thank you for those noble words which you have been pleased to use, for those words of encouragement to us in our labor for the promotion of the cause of education, and we thank you, sir, for your words of welcome to your city.

Had it not been that we were to meet here, I should not have had this agreeable duty to perform. The Committee on Nominations of the last year—and I see one of the most guilty of the party now before me—well knew that I should not have consented to occupy this position but for the circumstance that we were to meet this year in the heart of Massachusetts. I know the

heart of Worcester well ; I had been a resident of the city, and I knew what the heart of the people was, and that last argument induced me to accept the position that I now hold, that we should meet here and receive the cordial welcome now given. We are not disappointed ; and I can assure the members of the Institute that the words of welcome mean all that they are intended to express, and a great deal more. I know the heart of the people of Worcester. We are at home here, and shall find ourselves at home.

Worcester has been famous for its educational facilities and for its provision for education in the past. At the time of the origin of this Institute, and before the system of public schools was established on its present basis, Worcester was far in advance of the rest of the State in the western part. Outside of Boston there was nothing like it ; and the Worcester schools were pointed to as models by those who knew anything of them. I remember well that when I came to this section of the State, more than forty years ago, — I have the honor of being a native of the State, — I went into the infant schools then in operation. There was a regular graded system in this city, and such schools as were found in no other part of the State. I did not then know the secret of it, but have since learned it. It was this. Some of the most intelligent citizens of Worcester had secured an act of incorporation by which the central portion of the city should have corporate powers, with liberty to raise money for the support of additional schools. It was to this circumstance that the system then owed its excellent character. I will not say it was the wisest thing that could be done ; it was probably the wisest under the circumstances. At that time Worcester

a town of four thousand inhabitants, yet having a system of Infant and Grammar School, and a Latin Grammar or High School. Such a system presented a model to all the other parts of the State. How much has been done in other parts of the State in consequence of the example of the city of Worcester we cannot say, but we know that Worcester was pointed to, and justly so, as a model for a school system.

Permit me, without extending these remarks, to repeat our thanks for the most cordial welcome which you, sir, have extended to us. We hope our coming among you will be the means of our mutual improvement. Permit me, sir, in behalf of the Institute, to invite yourself, the members of your school board, and the citizens of Worcester generally, to come in, and take part in our deliberations.

ADDRESS TO THE INSTITUTE BY THE PRESIDENT.

Members of the American Institute of Instruction, and Ladies and Gentlemen:—We are here to hold the forty-first annual meeting of this leading Educational Association of our country. It was among the earliest agencies of the kind which have tended to bring about the present advancement in education. Forty-one years ago some of the principal educators of New England, especially of Massachusetts, met and organized the association whose anniversary we are here to celebrate. Most of those, and many who have taken a prominent part in our deliberations since, are now numbered among the dead. We cherish with profound respect the memory of such men as Wayland, Mann, Pierce, Bailey, Page, Sherwin, and a host of others who have left behind a noble record, illustrating by their whole

lives the interest they took in the cause of universal education. The records of our annual meetings, and the published volumes of lectures, will be a lasting memorial of the earnestness and zeal with which they devoted themselves to their cherished field of labor. They have labored, and we have entered into their labors. Though we feel an honest pride in looking at the vast proportions which our educational systems are assuming, let us remember that they are superstructures reared upon foundations laid by our fathers. It is to their wisdom and forecast, more than to any merit of ours, that our whole community is favored with the inestimable blessings of a free education.

Yet if we compare the actual condition of education now with what it was at the origin of this Institute, we shall see a growth unparalleled by any equal period in the history of the country. In every respect the progress has been striking.

Permit me, for the few moments allotted to this opening address, to advert to some of the changes which have been wrought in our educational systems during the past forty-one years. And in doing this I mean to imply that the transactions of this association have been among the most powerful agencies in bringing about these changes. Originating, as it did, before State Boards of Education existed, before state, county, or city superintendents were appointed, before normal schools or teachers' institutes were organized, before a systematic supervision of schools had placed before teachers higher standards of excellence, its first movements were to project better systems of education, better ideals of the purposes of education, better methods of influencing and moulding character. Hence the government of this association

tolerated and encouraged a wide range of discussion, admitting diverse and conflicting views to be presented, so that, if possible, from them all the true principles, might be evolved.

The organization of the association, from the very nature of its composition, has always been favorable to the evolution of resultant opinions. Unlike most educational associations which had preceded it, the American Institute of Instruction embraced every class and grade, the amateur as well as the professional educator, — the college president and college professor mingled most fraternally with the district school-master, — the preceptor of the academy with the public school-teacher, — the man of ample reading and ample research with the teacher of the most limited resources, — the mere theorist with the practical educator, — the experimenter and explorer with the most rigid stickler for authority.

It was impossible that the contact of such a diversity of thought and talent should not result in something profitable for all. The theorist would leave one of our sessions with his pinions clipped, the most inveterate dogmatist would return, at least, to apply oil to the wheels that revolved him through his daily routine. Better thoughts, higher views, additional incentives to exertion, have always resulted from the annual meetings of this association. And best of all, it has multiplied itself a hundred-fold in the county, State and national associations, which have sprung up all over the land to bear similar fruit in sections which it could not reach.

What if our association had embraced, to the exclusion of all others, only those who had a scientific or classical turn of mind, where had been the advantage to the cause universally?

Regarding, then, this association as one of the earliest and foremost agencies in advancing the cause of universal education, let us glance at some of the changes which the last forty-one years have witnessed.

I. In the *ideal* of education.

From the conception that education is useful as a means of gaining a livelihood or of making money, we are beginning to see in it the processes by which a human being — body, soul, and spirit — is developed into a higher manhood, to lead a higher and purer life. This will appear if we compare the standards aimed at in the two periods.

A vast majority of the people had no higher wish or aim than that their children should learn to read, write, and cipher, and contented themselves with almost any definition of these three fundamental requisites. Arithmetic was taught chiefly by rule, and that, too, in the most uninspiring manner.

"Sums," as they were called, were given out by the master, to be copied into a manuscript, or else were copied from an arithmetic which was made to float about the school to answer the demands of all who ciphered; and this done, the main step was taken: it only remained to apply to some one who knew how to get the answer; and this being duly entered in its place, the work was done.

It was not far from this time, however, that the appearance of Warren Colburn's little book produced a radical change in this particular study. Such teaching, common especially in the country schools, at that time, would scarcely be tolerated now in any district on our frontier settlements. Entirely different methods prevail.

Reading, as then taught, was the art of pronouncing words, at sight, from the printed page, — not the art of

expressing the thought and sentiment of the writer. It is to be regretted that our progress in this respect has not been as satisfactory as in the last-mentioned study. Although in many, in most of our good schools, just views of the reading lesson prevail, yet in our poorer classes of schools, the same lifeless methods continue. A correct pronunciation, a screeching tone of voice, a few criticisms on inflections and pauses, embrace the whole. The idea that such a thing as thought or sentiment has anything to do with school reading seems not to be entertained.

There is yet work to be done by this and other institutes to diffuse more widely the best method of teaching reading, indeed of teaching language in all its uses, as the immediate instrument of thought and feeling. Best of all the three, were the methods of teaching writing; not but that there have been improvements. But from the nature of the exercise we cannot expect the same improvement as in the other branches. Besides an advance in the methods of teaching these branches, we have added materially to the number of studies taught, thereby contributing greatly to the general intelligence. Grammar, geography, history, the rudiments of chemistry and natural philosophy are taught, and well taught, in our common schools. And this suggests the inquiry: How is it that we gain the time to teach so many additional branches? The answer will appear in another important difference.

In the modern methods, *form* has given place in a great measure to *insight*. This change is capable of a very wide illustration. What I mean by it is this: Formerly, a subject was taught, not by unfolding the ideas contained within itself, but by directing attention to the external forms by which it was exhibited. In algebra, for instance, it was insisted that a term was *transposed*,

that is, carried over from one side of an equation to the other, by changing its sign, whereas the idea is, that it is cancelled from one side, and a compensation made on the other, by addition or subtraction. In grammar, a tense was perfect because the verb had the external sign *have*, and not because it expressed the idea of completed action. In arithmetic, addition was made to consist in writing down several numbers, units under units, tens under tens, etc., then in adding the column of units, then the column of tens, and so on,—not because the *idea* of the aggregation of several large numbers, by taking together all their like parts, renders such a procedure convenient, not necessary, but because the *form* of the rule so has it.

Now in all our best schools the *idea*, *plan*, and *motive* of every process comes first, and the *form* as a consequence.

The form, and the best form, should be acquired, but always as subordinate to the idea. It is this very reversal of the old order, that gives the teacher such an immense gain in time. It involves, of necessity, much oral discussion, it creates a relish for study, it results in the habit of consecutive thinking, it strengthens and improves the power of expression, and is the most natural, simple, and interesting method of teaching.

Akin to this is another change equally important, that in which mere *authority* is absorbed and lost in *influence*. And here I mean influence in the literal sense of the term,—the inflowing of the teacher's spirit, modes of thinking and doing, into the mind and heart of the child,—the process by which he writes laws inwardly on the heart, in contrast with the other process of writing them outwardly on tables of stone, to be read, feared, and obeyed by external compulsion.

Far be it from me to say one word against the teacher's authority. Authority there must be, but that authority which lies veiled under the teacher's personal power is the best of all authority. The power to interest, the power to attract, the power to inspire, soon takes the place of all show of authority. In this respect, a great change has been wrought within the last forty years. All these changes spring from a better conception of the relations and duties of the teacher.

II. But let me ask you, in the second place, to glance at the *forces* at work, to produce these higher ideals.

I say *forces*, for we cannot trace these results back to any one cause. Though all may be summed up by saying that the general sentiment of the people has demanded these changes, this does not explain the agencies which have produced this advance of public sentiment.

Our industrial interests entering into competition with similar interests abroad, have created a demand for a higher type of scientific scholarship. Hence our scientific schools, and scientific departments in the colleges and academies. The higher types of classical, scientific, and philosophical research in the universities of Europe have stimulated the scholarship of our country, and this, again, by means of popular lectures, our normal schools, and institutes, has acted upon the teachers of our lower schools, as well as upon the community at large.

But let us remember that forces are determined, not by directing our inquiries into their nature, but by investigating their results. No one at all conversant with the vast changes that distinguish the present state of education from that of forty years ago, will doubt for one moment that powerful agencies have been at work. The advance in teachers' wages from \$10 to \$50 per month,

from salaries of \$500 to \$2,500, is an unmistakable proof of a higher activity. Mark again the great movements towards a better organization of our schools, in passing from the old district systems to the graded system. I need not dwell upon the advantages arising from the change, for you all understand them.

Note the change in the supervision of our schools. A responsible superintendent is now placed over the whole system in almost all of our large cities.

Witness the change in the method of organizing, classifying, and disciplining our schools; the methods of instruction; the general tone of intercourse between teacher and pupil.

Time would fail me were I to dwell upon the marked progress in school-house architecture alone. Compare the school-houses of to-day with those of thirty years ago, and the change is surprising.

Observe the change in respect to the general intelligence of our teachers. Our common schools employ many of the graduates of our colleges.

Nor have these changes been produced merely upon our common schools. Glance, if you please, at the condition of our higher institutions—our academies and colleges—as they are now and were then. The advantages of the graded system were then understood only by leading educators. It was applied, and that imperfectly only, in our large cities.

High schools in villages and the larger towns were scarcely known. Worcester, by securing corporate rights for its central district, far excelled any other equal population outside of Boston. In the majority of the large towns, the central portion of the population was so divided into school districts that very little could be

done by way of gradation. The result was that the mere rudiments only could be taught in the public schools. For the higher English branches, and for the classical course preparatory to entrance into our colleges, academies and private schools were a necessity, even in our cities and large towns. As was natural, private convenience and local ambition, rather than a regard for the needs of the different sections of the community, determined the location of these academies. Some of them thrived, others maintained a sickly existence through the year; others still were intermittent. The number was altogether too great, and the consequent resources of most of them altogether too small, for anything like marked efficiency. Some were incorporated, others were not; some had just funds enough to spoil them; others, none at all; while here and there one was well endowed.

The advancement of popular education, with its system of high and central schools, has swept most of these intermittent and feeble academies out of existence, transmuting others into local high schools, thereby securing better and more thorough work than these ever could accomplish.

In the mean time, such academies as Phillips (Exeter), Phillips (Andover), Williston, Wilbraham, and others, have been striking their roots deeper into the soil, exhibiting a vigor of life which prove beyond all doubt that the academy has a place and a mission, notwithstanding the improvements consequent upon a great popular movement. The number has been greatly diminished, the quality greatly improved.

Our system of collegiate instruction was borrowed from England, and was administered in all our colleges

from generation to generation, with a fidelity to the original model, that seemed to prove that whatever change might come over other interests in society, one thing was immutable. Their curriculum, their methods, and the spirit with which they were administered, with here and there slight changes and improvements, were perpetuated from age to age, with little or no regard to the immediate wants of the community.

But within the latter part of the period we are contemplating, a great change has come over these commanding institutions of our land.

The practical wants of the community have been heeded. Scientific departments have been attached, in some way or other, to nearly all our colleges, giving rise to a new degree conferred upon those who complete a course, widely departing from the former college curriculum.

Forty years ago, few, if any, of the various college faculties concerned themselves in the slightest degree with the meagre courses of study pursued in the common schools. Very few, if any, served upon the school committees in the towns or cities where they were located. In short, the college stood at a wide remove from the masses of the people. In this respect a radical change has been brought about. In Harvard, Yale, Brown, and other colleges, the members of the Faculty are always ready to serve the interests of popular education, many of them being engaged actively on the school committees,—at all times lending their influence and advice in shaping courses of instruction, and raising to a higher standard of excellence the public school system.

But it is time to bring these hastily prepared remarks to a close.

The government of the Institute has taken its customary care to present you with a variety of topics, to be discussed by some of our ablest educators. I trust that the session will be found in all respects a profitable one.

Appointments were made as follows:—

Committee on Nomination of Officers—D. B. Hagar, Salem; A. P. Marble, Worcester; J. S. Barrell, Lewiston, Me.; D. W. Hoyt, Providence, R. I.; M. G. Daniell, Boston Highlands; David Crosby, Nashua, N. H.; D. N. Camp, New Britain, Ct.

On Teachers and Teachers' Places—T. W. Bicknell, Providence, R. I.; J. S. Russell, Lowell; H. E. Sawyer, Middletown, Ct.

On Resolutions—A. J. Phipps, Medford; Daniel Leach, Providence, R. I.; Thomas H. Barnes, Boston.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The first matter presented at the afternoon session was a paper upon "*The Duty of our large Towns to support Evening Schools*," by Rev. A. A. Miner, D.D., President of Tufts College, as follows:

PAPER OF REV. DR. MINER.

In very many respects our common schools are yet problematic. The age at which children should enter them; the number of pupils that can be profitably placed under the same teacher; the branches of an education which should be taught therein; and how far a rigid philosophy, explaining every step to the comprehension of the child, as against the practice of memorizing what mature years alone can fully understand, should determine the order and scope of subjects,—are all matters in regard to which our current opinions and practices may be destined to undergo revolutions. But the wisdom,

and necessity even, of maintaining common schools themselves, especially in a republic like ours, may be considered as established.

It is pertinent, however, to inquire, on what grounds do we rest their defence? How can the State justify itself in the support of free schools, by general taxation, including, of course, the taxation of the childless, on the one hand, and compelling attendance thereon, on the other hand? Not, surely, in their utility to the individual. Education is valuable to the child, in the development of its faculties and powers, in fitting it for the enterprises of life, and in making possible those higher spiritual attainments in which is involved true good. These considerations are adequate grounds of parental action, and are analogous to those which prompt him to the more direct moral and religious training of the child.

But when once the State has adopted this principle of action, it steps in between the parent and the child, and imposes its own thought, even in the most vital matters, upon the consciences of both. Until the State can exhibit the sign-manual of Heaven, it may not take in charge the final interest of immortal beings. Even the parent, ordained of God to mould for a time the plastic spiritual nature of the child, of necessity yields his dominion when reason is seated upon her throne. If the parent is unable to maintain his prerogative, temporary in its nature, though divinely appointed, much less can the State take up that prerogative where the parent lays it down. In the final analysis, the human soul is sacred to the dominion of the God of truth, being defended by angelic hosts, with swords of flame, from the usurpations of the State, with its manifold ambitions on the one hand, and of the church, whether fallible or infallible, on the other.

On quite other grounds, then, must the State rest its defence of its free-school system. Those grounds respect the State, rather than individuals. General intelligence and virtue, it is but trite to remark, are the essential conditions of free institutions. Self-preservation, that law which is the fruitful mother of all laws, commands the maintenance of the common school and the general diffusion of knowledge. Obedient to this command, the tide of common-school opportunity is rising higher and higher in all our free States, and is rapidly submerging those which but lately were in thrall.

To induce towns to liberal taxation and expenditure, with a view to the maintenance of schools of high grade throughout a suitable portion of the year, many of our commonwealths distribute annually large sums of money from the income of school funds or from other sources, thus proffering enhanced opportunity for education to all our youth. Even the text-books required, in some of our States, are furnished to poorer families at the public expense.

Thus far, however, our laws but open the doors, and beckon our youth to enter the halls of learning. Had all parents a suitable appreciation of the value of education, this would be sufficient. These opportunities would be availed of, the interests of the individual would be secured, and, immigration aside, the welfare of the State conserved.

But, in the absence of such adequate appreciation, various temptations, arising from passion, pride, or poverty, close again the open doors, restrain many children and youth, especially in our larger towns, from attendance upon the schools, and thus perpetuate ignorance and crime. The intelligent and virtuous majority main-

tain ample opportunities and instrumentalities for the education of all; the ignorant and vicious minority, notwithstanding those opportunities, perpetuate barbarian hordes within our gates.

What can be done in such an emergency? The solicitations, both of opportunity and of interest, with this minority, are alike unavailing. Some new principle must be invoked. A new principle is invoked. The State does not hesitate to apply a little gentle coercion. It prohibits the employment in her manufactories of children under a certain age, except upon the condition that they have attended school at least three months within the year. But this provision is inadequate. Even if the law were fully obeyed, it would still be inadequate: first, because the time of required attendance is too brief; and, secondly, because there are many youths above the specified age, in all our cities and principal towns, to whom the law does not apply.

What can be done for them? Two courses suggest themselves, both of which are open to objections. The first is to extend the law requiring attendance upon school to those of greater age. The second is the establishment of evening schools in our principal towns, which such young men and women may attend simultaneously with the pursuit of their daily avocations.

To the first of these remedies,—disability in employment by reason of non-attendance upon school,—it may be objected that it does not appear to be equally befitting those who are past the ordinary school age. To a great extent inoperative on behalf of the younger class, it would be still more so on behalf of the older. Already they have passed on to other responsibilities. Other laws of widely different character—laws of human enact-

ment, not less than those of political economy and social science — invite them to new fields of labor and of privilege. Already accustomed to act for themselves, the laws recognize their legal competency to make contracts, under various limitations, including even a contract of marriage, *in presenti* if not *in futuro*. It is hardly possible to throw such youths back into a condition of utter pupillage; hardly possible to meet their needs by any coercive enactment that would not oftentimes include their parents as surely as themselves.

The second remedy, the establishment of evening schools, though more easily adopted, and the only one, perhaps, at present practicable, does not seem altogether satisfactory. Such schools will appeal to our youth as a kind of make-shift, an indifferent class of supplementary measures, — an impression likely to be strengthened by the relative inadequacy of their appointments, as regards school-rooms, school furniture, maps, charts, globes, library, and apparatus, and even as regards the teachers themselves. Besides, the pupils will come to their intellectual tasks wearied by the active pursuits of the day; and flagging spirits are little likely to achieve great successes. Nor will the fact that the important business of education is for them consigned to a mere remnant of the day, and that the portion which their companions usually devote to amusements, greatly nurture an ambition as yet scarcely begotten.

These objections, it must be confessed, however, spring rather from evils which threaten incidentally to attach to evening schools, than from anything necessarily inhering in them. Give them sufficient dignity, impart to them a character adequate to the ends in view, let them be as well appointed, well furnished, and well taught as

are the day schools, and there will remain only the really inherent difficulties of such schools,—the weariness of the pupil, and the shortness of the session. Perhaps even these may not prove to be necessarily inherent, but only the incidents of other evils which are curable,—such as too protracted hours of labor, and too narrow an aim in the schools themselves. If the day of toil shall be shortened, the evening of study may be lengthened; and if the pupil may come with less weariness from the one, he may bring more of sprightliness to the other.

What relations may be ultimately established between the popular demand of the laborer for fewer hours of toil, that he may have opportunity for self-culture, and some possible system of evening instruction, it would be hazardous at present to conjecture. But if the popular clamor on this subject is maintained in good faith; if it aims at solid intellectual advancement, and not at mere intellectual dissipation, as in novel reading, or at amusement, idleness, or indulgence, then the evening school may prove the embryo of an institution not less important than the noblest in our land; an institution from which, not the advanced youth alone, but maturer manhood, may draw never-failing increments of wisdom. History, metaphysics, science, literature, and art may all shed their genial and quickening light upon the common understanding and the common heart.

But the attempt to realize such a dream may develop new difficulties and raise new problems. How will it fare, for example, with our country's industries? To maintain and enhance our material prosperity, we must buy and sell in the open markets of the world. How can the products of machinery run but eight hours a day, in a country where capital commands seven per cent

interest, compete in the marts of the world with the products of other machinery, run fourteen hours a day, in a country where capital commands but three and a half per cent? Or will our noble example become contagious, and disproportionate competition cease? Will the industries of other countries be confined to like hours of labor, and the laborers of all lands march in solid battalions up the hill of science? Greatly reduced hours of labor will necessarily demand a reduction in the world's consumption. Shall that reduction be in the necessities, or in the luxuries of life? Shall we forego our beef at dinner, substituting the Irishman's staple of potatoes and salt; or shall we surrender our tobacco and whiskey, our furbelows and dresses six stories high? In this fickle and often severe climate, shall we sacrifice our flannels for a fashionable fan or handkerchief, and the fuel on our hearthstone for a silver door-plate; or shall our expenditures respect our permanent needs, rather than the eyes of an envious world? What, in a word, will then be the issue of the conflict which vanity ever wages with want? He is a bold man who shall undertake to prophesy.

But we are anticipating problems which may never arise. We are not now called to resolve the intricacies of economic science. The question of to-day is not the founding of universities with evening sessions, but the far humbler one of evening schools for our neglected youth. The occasion for this experiment, be it observed, is accidental. Our common-school system contemplates the education of all our youth. Its failure to secure this result is attributable mainly to two causes,—defects in the system or in our working under it, and the introduction into our midst of a foreign class who have never

known its power. When the system shall have become effective with all our native population, and immigration shall have ceased, the exigency demanding evening schools, especially with their present aim and drift, will have passed away. But consider how very far distant is that day. Consider what an immeasurable advance must be made in the public appreciation of education before it can arrive. Consider what an almost inexhaustible national domain must be occupied before immigration will cease.

Now the evening school will probably prove the most efficient instrumentality for the advancement of this public appreciation of education, and therefore of remedying the practical defects of the present school system. Ignorance, like wisdom, tends to perpetuate itself. The uneducated children of the next generation will have descended from the persons on whose behalf we plead to-day. Immigration aside, we ought to cure the necessity for evening schools in a single generation. Passing the individual, and regarding only the welfare of the state, we ought so to enforce our educational schemes that a healthy child cannot grow up in ignorance, in any of our commonwealths. Not only should the school be maintained, but every child should be educated. The town, perhaps, should be held responsible for its education. Let the penalty be the loss of its portion of the income of the School Fund. The conditions on which that income is distributed, might be amended by adding, *provided there shall be found, within the limits of the town, no native-born child, twelve years of age, unable to read.*

Such aims might require an indefinite enlargement of our educational charities. Not text-books alone, but the means of subsistence as well, for both parent and

child, might in some cases be required. But such charities would be economic charities. There are charities that tend to poverty, that multiply paupers. Such are not a few of the charities of our great cities,—charities which invite the young and the old of every class, from country homes, with their adequate though simple means of subsistence, to all the hazards of a city life, where they may find little work and less pay. The natural retributions of misjudgment and folly in this regard, namely, want and suffering, are put aside,—by systematic but mistaken benevolence. The young woman who scorns two or three dollars a week, with board included, for service in a respectable country family, does not hesitate to brave the dangers of a city life, where her legitimate income may be five dollars a week and her outgoes six, because, forsooth, she knows there is a semi-pauper boarding house, to which she can fly in emergencies. We advertise throughout the country our Christian welcome of young men, and when they reach us we have nothing for them to do. We are fully aware that the drinking usages of the community are the source of three-fourths of the pauperism and crime in our midst; and yet we recommend and vote the relaxation of our prohibitory liquor laws, and the enlargement of our poor-houses and prisons, all in the same breath. In a thousand ways, we pour out our wealth like water, only to increase the evils it is intended to cure. The *Spectator*, in a recent issue, complains that the Poor Laws of England have so extinguished the virtues as to give her a permanent inheritance of a million of paupers.

It is a grave question whether our own country cannot boast as many who are unable to read. The first Annual Report of the Secretary and General Agent,

Mr. Austin, of the Rhode Island Educational Union, put into my hands to-day, states that there are 10,000 persons, beyond the usual school age, who *cannot read at all*. Calling the population of Rhode Island 300,000, and that of our whole country 40,000,000, we should have in our whole country, were the proportion the same, more than 1,300,000 persons, beyond the usual school age, who cannot read at all; and perhaps as many more who can read to little purpose. Instead of emulating the political science of England in respect to her paupers, let us so disburse our charities that every dollar shall bring forth a hundred-fold in the intelligence and thrift of those on whom it is expended. No moneys can more surely do this, than those expended in education; and no class of the uneducated send forth a more effective cry than those on whose behalf we plead for evening schools. Let every town of three or four thousand inhabitants be required by law to establish at least one evening school; let it be well appointed; let it receive the same official nurture that is bestowed upon schools now established; and let all the providential suggestions and necessary outgrowth of the measure be bravely accepted, and new fields of usefulness may be expected to open, yielding still richer harvests of intellectual and moral good.

DISCUSSION.

After the reading of the paper by Dr. Miner, a discussion of the same followed.

Mr. J. C. Greenough, of Westfield, said he had held that in education the wants of the mind should be the guide, rather than the specific employment of the individual. In a republic, every intelligent man has an opportunity

to take that position and to enter that employment for which his talents and acquirements entitle him; and it is quite difficult to give that specific education which the employment of the individual may demand. It is common to hear men in business express their need of some knowledge having a special relation to their specific department of labor; and they wish for an opportunity to study that branch which will help them most in their business. If the system proposed in the paper which was read, could be carried out, this want might be supplied by furnishing lectures on those scientific subjects with which men in business need to be made familiar. Science could thus be made a practical thing.

Mr. A. J. Phipps, agent of the Mass. Board of Education, said that instead of looking at this higher education we ought to provide for the education of the large number who are entirely destitute of elementary education. It is to meet the wants of this class, not only in New England, but throughout the country, that evening schools are demanded. Thirteen years ago a law was passed by the Legislature of Massachusetts, of a permissive character, allowing any town to establish and maintain evening schools, for persons above fifteen years of age. Now twenty-one towns and eleven cities only report the establishment of such schools. Four of our principal cities do not have, and have not had, such schools. Seven of the twenty-one towns are in Middlesex County. There are six counties in the State in which no evening school has been established. The amount appropriated for the support of the twenty-one schools was a little over \$14,000 last year, and the number instructed in them, not including those of Boston, was 2,800 males and 1,400 females, with an average attend-

ance of 2,200. The length of time that the schools were kept varied from one to five months. He hoped that other States had done more for the large class of persons needing this instruction than Massachusetts.

Rev. J. H. Twombly, of Charlestown, thought that there were probably nearly a million and a half of adults in our country, not including the colored population, who are unable to read and write. They need the instruction to be given in evening schools. It was wrong to place these schools in poor rooms, and with few facilities for giving instruction. They should have good rooms, well lighted, and have the best teachers. Good maps, globes, and other apparatus should be provided, and lectures on scientific subjects may profitably be given in a familiar manner.

Rev. Daniel Leach, of Providence, stated some facts in regard to the success of evening schools in Providence. They were commenced there about twenty years ago, among the first in New England, and they now form part of the regular school system of the city, and are under the charge of a committee like the other schools. There were nearly two thousand in attendance last winter, none being allowed to attend who can attend the day schools. The teachers are from the university, having had experience in teaching previously, and they have proved very successful. The schools are visited and encouraged by the Governor, the Mayor, and other prominent men. Many of the pupils who were scarcely able to read when they entered the school, have continued to work during the day, and have fitted themselves for college in the evening school and in their study at home. Several instances were stated to show the interest taken in these schools both by the pupils themselves and the

people of the city. The number in attendance at the close of the schools was nearly as great as at the commencement, in consequence of this interest, and the efforts made to impress the pupils with their importance to them. They are the most popular schools in the city at present, the city council being ready to grant any reasonable appropriation for them. They are found to be the cheapest police regulation that can be adopted for such a city. In some cases, too, pupils who attended the evening schools but two hours a day, working the rest of the time, made greater progress than those who attended the day schools all the time. Five vacation schools were now also opened there, where pupils can go during the vacation of the public schools, as a sort of place of refuge, where the pupils are not required to study; but they receive instruction in regard to the proprieties of life. The results are gratifying, the children spending their time in sewing or reading, without the ordinary restraints of school, though still taught to be respectful, and to cultivate the amenities of life.

The President called attention to some facts connected with the evening schools of Providence, that in the regulations of the city schools a standing committee is provided for on the evening schools, and an appropriation made for their support, just as in everything else. In the annual report, a report of the evening schools is as distinctly brought forward as any other. The attendance is marked, and the regulations are as much regarded as any. The population of the city is not far from 70,000, and 2,000 children attend evening schools, who are not permitted to do so, if they can attend the day schools.

Mr. Leach, in answer to inquiries, stated that the even-

ing schools were held five evenings in a week, from seven to nine o'clock, for five months. The schools are examined as the other schools. There was a danger that children would leave the day schools and attend the evening schools, but that has been provided against by the records of the various schools. There is no law to compel attendance in any school, as there should be. Between forty and fifty teachers are employed.

Mr. Z. Richards, of Washington, spoke of the attractions in most cities which tend to draw children away from evening schools, as being a great hinderance to their success. This can be counteracted only by making the evening schools themselves so attractive as to draw the children away from the places where they are inclined to resort. Even our day schools are not managed as they should be, to accomplish the greatest amount of good.

Rev. Mr. Twombly thought that in order to appreciate the value of the evening schools in any place, it was necessary to know how many children are in the day schools, and what per cent of all the children attend school. In Charlestown, having less than 30,000 inhabitants, there are about 5,200 children in the day schools; according to that, the number of children in the public schools in Providence ought to be 12,000. Where the evening schools flourish, there is generally a want of attendance at the day schools. They are a remedy, and one that need not be employed if the day schools were what they should be.

Rev. O. Chute, of Vineland, N. J. If there were a law enforcing attendance at school, there would be no persons between certain ages not in some one of the schools, and in that community there would be no person not

properly educated. Such a law ought to be enforced, and the need of evening schools would then be obviated.

The President. It is important for members of the Institute to bear in mind that the evening schools have been a growth in Providence; no sudden excitement has brought them to their present state, but they have come up from small beginnings through a period of twenty years. No system of evening schools can arise in one or five years; it must be a growth. Now no schools in Providence are visited with more interest, or supported better by the supervision of influential men, than the evening schools.

Mr. Samuel Austin, of Providence, said he was gratified with the able essay of Dr. Miner. No one will credit that there is so great an amount of ignorance throughout the country who has not investigated the matter, and especially in the manufacturing districts. The facts have been collected in Rhode Island, and if the same thing were done in other States, possibly an equal amount of illiteracy might be found. He had no doubt of the duty of the towns to establish evening schools. They are not an ultimatum, but are the means of educating people up to an appreciation of the value of education as it may be secured in other schools. That has been the effect in Rhode Island. The fathers and mothers who have gained some knowledge in the evening schools, invariably determined to give their children an opportunity to attend the day schools first, and then go to work in the mill. In Rhode Island, the importance of having the best appointed rooms, with plenty of light and attractive surroundings, is recognized. Though territorially smaller than Worcester County, that State has thirty evening schools in active operation, and there will be many more

this year. The towns are gradually adopting the method, as towns.

In Pennsylvania there were 629,000 children enrolled in 1865, while the average attendance at school was less than half that number, 307,000. In Rhode Island we grant that there are 15,000 at least unable to write their own names, and 10,000 unable to read at all, even the Bible.

Mr. Phipps. I would like to ask whether there is one per cent, or one-half of one per cent even, of that number, who are of the native population. If so, it is not creditable to our neighboring State.

Mr. Austin. I cannot answer that. Whether foreigners or not, at any rate they are men, and our fellow-citizens. If we grant that these are foreigners, where is the remedy? So impressed was Senator Foster with the gravity of this question that at "commencement dinner" he declared "the duty of providing for the education of the native increase of our people, is the *smallest* of our duties." Said he, "Think of the numbers thrown upon our Atlantic border, our extended coast receiving, almost every day, emigrants from Europe, of all ages, the great mass of them ignorant, needing and demanding education." "What an addition to the ordinary responsibility of the nation, in respect to the education of its people!" The language of Senator Wilson upon the same subject was also quoted. In Rhode Island, the manufacturers are acting in accordance with those ideas, and they are providing the means of educating this class of their employees, by building rooms expressly for the purpose, and supplying good teachers and suitable apparatus. The evening school, and the agencies that grow immediately out of it, will be demanded for a long time to come.

The remainder of the afternoon session was occupied by an exercise conducted by Mr. L. W. Mason, of Boston, illustrating his method of teaching music in the public schools.

EVENING SESSION.

The Institute met at 8 o'clock this evening, in the large hall, and the lecture of the evening was the only exercise, being on "*Poetry in Education*," by Rev. J. L. Diman, Prof. of History and Political Economy in Brown University.

SECOND DAY.

THURSDAY, July 28, 1870.

The Institute was called to order by the President, at 9 A. M. Prayer was offered by Rev. J. H. Twombly, of Charlestown.

THE PLACE AND WORK OF ACADEMIES IN OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

This subject was introduced by a paper from Rev. J. B. Dow, as follows:—

The place in order of the academy in our system of educational agencies, must be determined, of course, by the work which it has to do. The aim of a true system of education must be, first of all, the development of the individual, the production of the highest and best type of human being, all things considered. As a specific part of this work, there must be some special training for the particular life-work of the individual. Hence our educational system has three parts: Preparatory Schools,

Colleges or Universities, and Professional Schools. The preparatory schools take the untrained and unfurnished mind of youth, quicken it, teach it the nature and use of its powers, hold it to its tasks through that period in which intellectual effort is drudgery, and carry it, already feeling in some measure the charm of liberal culture, to the threshold of the college. Here the individual is supposed to enter upon a course of extensive, exhaustive, and philosophical study, which is to continue through life. There comes a time, however, and far too soon, in most cases, for the highest aim of an education, when the studies of the individual must be concentrated upon some art or profession by which a livelihood is to be earned. At this point he enters the professional school.

Now the aim of the public schools, including the high schools, relative to the whole educational system, is to do the work of preparation indicated above. With the public schools, the colleges, and the professional schools, therefore, our school system would seem to be complete. No place or work would appear to be left for the academy. Such, perhaps, would be the case if all persons were so situated as to avail themselves of the public high school, and also of the college and professional school; though even then one important occasion for the academy would remain. When public high schools began to be established by law in New England, it was thought by many that the necessity for academies would cease. Experience, however, has shown the contrary. Unendowed academies, poorly furnished and feebly conducted, have indeed ceased to have any value, and are fast going out of existence. As mere town schools they can rarely have any excellence, and often

hinder the establishment of good high schools. It is not at all of such effete institutions that we now speak; but for well-endowed academies, thoroughly furnished with teachers and apparatus, able to give thorough, systematic, and comprehensive instruction in those studies which belong in them, and so situated as to meet the wants of a wide region of country, there is still a place and a work, never more than now.

I. *The academy is needed first of all as a preparator school.* The course of study in the public schools, just because they are public schools, must be adapted not only to the average mental ability of the scholars in them, or even it may be to a mental ability below the average; but also to the average age of the scholars, and be rigorously adhered to. Such a system, excellent in itself, and of incalculable value to the state and to the interests of education, cannot possibly meet the wants of all who seek an education. The mental condition and the circumstances of our youth are far too varied to be met in all cases by so rigid a system. Even the public schools of grades below the high school are not found in practice to be a substitute entirely for private schools, and so it happens that private, primary, intermediate, and grammar schools are maintained in every large town. Something freer, something at once thorough, systematic, and severe in discipline, and yet capable of a wider and more varied adaptation, is needed.

Particularly is this true of the high school. There are many whose course of study is necessarily interrupted, and who must get their preparation for college piecemeal. There are many also who begin their classical studies late in youth, and who not only must, but can do the work of four years for an average high-school boy, in

three or even two years, possibly omitting till later in life some of the studies of the high-school course. Every principal of an academy can recall instances of young men who came to his school too old, and with minds too little formed for study, to be willing to enter, as they would need, a public grammar school, and take seats with the sharp boys and girls there to be found; but who, after a little while, went on rapidly, through their arithmetic, geography, and grammar, through their Latin, Greek, and algebra; and though entering college later in life than is desirable, yet became most useful and valuable men in professional life. For such men, the academy is the appropriate school. The students in our academies, as a class, are older than those in our high schools. The advancement in study, therefore, can be more rapid as a whole. Yet some classes advance more rapidly than others, being composed of those who have been hindered and interrupted in the past, but are now able by extra exertions to make up for lost time. Classes begin the classics and mathematics more than once a year, those that commence later hastening to overtake those that begin earlier, and being consolidated with them by the middle of the course. The academy is the desirable school, also, for those mentioned above as commencing their preparatory course late in youth, for this reason also — that here they find themselves associated with others, in like situation and of like age with themselves, and, therefore, they hold here such rank and enjoy such companionship as are due to their moral and social qualities, without regard to the stage of their educational progress. Thus, for very many of the best minds among the youth of the land, the well-endowed academy must be an almost indispensable school.

But another reason for the existence of academies, of far greater importance than that now discussed, is that very many of those who are awakened to seek a liberal education, are not so situated as to avail themselves of a public high school. Of the three hundred and thirty-five towns in Massachusetts, but one hundred and seventy-five maintain high schools. The youth of a large portion of the State, therefore, have no opportunity to attend a public high school. In other parts of the country the number who for this reason cannot attend a high school must be very much greater. Yet from those districts of country in which there are no high schools come a very large proportion, and if we mistake not, the greater part, of the young men in our colleges. For all such the academy is a necessity.

Many, too, of the high schools that are maintained, however valuable they may be as the highest grade of school in their towns, are second or third rate preparatory schools, when compared with the best high schools and academies.

There is, moreover, a growing feeling in the large towns and cities, that the chief aim of the high school should be to prepare young men and women for immediate entrance upon active life, rather than for college. This feeling grows out of the fact that the great majority of boys and girls do enter upon active life without a collegiate course. It is felt that the chief attention of the high school should be to their special wants. Thus it will happen that even those scholars who have access to a high school will in many instances desire to fit for college in an academy of high grade, where the preparation of youth for college is the most prominent aim, and is therefore more thoroughly done.

Indeed, there is this marked difference, as a rule, between the high school and the academy, that in the former the current sets strongly towards business and an early close of the course of study, while in the latter it sets towards college and a literary life.

The relative value of the high school and the academy in the preparation of young men for college, as that work is now performed, can be inferred from the following facts. There are in the State of Massachusetts 175 high schools and 45 incorporated academies. If we suppose that of the 481 unincorporated academies and private schools, as many as 45 are schools in which boys fit for college, we have 90 private schools and 175 public schools fitting boys for college. In New England at large, the proportion of public high schools to private schools of the same grade fitting boys for college cannot be far from the same. In other words, there are about twice as many public high schools as private schools and academies preparing boys for college. Yet the statistics of New England colleges show that two-thirds of the students in them were prepared for college in private schools and academies. These private schools and academies, moreover, are generally in regions where the best high schools also are to be found. From these facts we infer that, however useful in our educational system the high school is, it does not supersede the necessity for private schools and academies in the work of preparing young men for college; that in fact the private school and academy in which classical studies are prominent must be the principal source of young men for the colleges rather than the public high school, in which, from the necessity of the case, those studies which prepare youth for an early entrance upon active life are made most prominent.

When, however, we compare these private schools among themselves, it is evident that the liberally endowed academy, amply furnished with teachers and apparatus for instruction, and able by reason of its endowments to make its charges for room-rent and tuition merely nominal, must be superior to the unendowed private school, dependent for its entire income upon the tuition fees which it receives ; particularly when we consider the wants of the whole country.

But the preparation of students for college is by no means the entire work of the academy. Equally important certainly is the service it renders to those who cannot, or, for various reasons, will not avail themselves of a college course. To thousands of such persons in every generation the academy is their only university. How many preachers, lawyers, doctors, and teachers have had no other. How many men and women of excellent general culture are indebted to the academy for the best part of their literary training. There they studied more of mathematics, more of the languages ancient and modern, more of metaphysics, logic, history, and rhetoric than they could have studied in the best of the public high schools, or, at least in the case of the very great majority of them, than in any high school within their reach. There they found libraries, small as compared with college libraries, but larger than they could elsewhere have found. There they found literary societies far more vigorous and profitable than any to be found within college walls. There they breathed an atmosphere of culture which ennobled them, and elevated the society in which they subsequently moved. There are many persons who on leaving the public schools of their own towns and villages desire a year or two of further

study, but who cannot go to college. There are many who are compelled to leave the public schools quite early in youth, and who, at the age of eighteen or twenty, or even later, are able to enter school again for a while. They find no place for themselves in the public schools. The latter are constituted to meet the wants of another class of students, who constitute the majority of the advanced pupils in a town. The academy, however, is designedly constituted in part to meet just the wants of these persons; and though they are a minority in any one town, gathered from many towns they form a considerable number of persons whose education is of great importance to the world.

Indeed, without the academy there is sure to be a deep and ever-widening chasm between the great multitude whose education is carried no farther than the grammar school, or, in the larger towns and cities, the English high school, and the comparatively few who pursue a liberal course of study in the colleges and professional schools. Such a chasm has a tendency to divide society into castes, and imperils our free institutions. Knowledge is power; and, like every kind of power, is sure to become tyrannical if it can raise itself far enough above the people. Let there be, however, a large class of men and women in the community who are at once educated and yet not professional scholars; who are at once in fellowship with the great body of men of business and manual labor, and also with the best educated men of the learned professions, and neither political, social, nor ecclesiastical tyranny can be possible.

There is a tyranny, also, of ignorance and brute force. Strikes and other attempts of operatives to intimidate and control capital are possible only where large bodies

of men stand on the same level of intellectual poverty. Scatter among them one man or woman in ten who shall be equal in culture, general intelligence, and power of thought to the best educated among capitalists, and the folly and fanaticism of labor reform would scarcely be possible.

If, then, this chasm is to be filled between the mass of men and women who do not go beyond the grammar school in their education, and the few who enter the learned professions, there must be schools of a character adapted to fill it. The public high school serves this purpose in part. It should be carefully fostered, and made to do it more perfectly within its sphere. But there is a large number whom it cannot reach, and its own range is limited by its connection with the public school system. Another school is needed, inviting pupils from all parts of the country, so liberally endowed as to be nearly a free school, a very university in its range of studies, though more limited, of course, in the extent to which it pursues them. Such a school the academy has grown to be in some notable instances in America, and as such nothing can fill its place.

It should be remembered, too, that the academy has also this influence upon the higher education of the college. Out of the large number who come to the academy with no further purpose than to pursue their studies a little farther before entering upon business, a good number each year catch the spirit of the literary community in which they find themselves, and decide to go on to college. Others, who cannot take this further step, see to it that their children are able and disposed to do so. The higher, too, the standard of education is raised in the intermediate school, and the more widely education is

diffused among the middle classes of society, the higher will the standard be in the college.

That the academy is the only university whose advantages a large number of the most valuable members of society enjoy, is to be gathered from the number in attendance in the academies of New England. A very incomplete collection of statistics shows more than ten thousand different pupils in them each year. Of this number, not one-tenth enter college.

Certainly, then, no state can afford to neglect its academies. It may be difficult to say precisely what sort of a school the academy is. It is not a grammar school, yet it often does the work of the grammar school; not solely a classical school for fitting boys and girls for college, yet this is one of its most prominent features; not a normal school, yet hundreds of our teachers have no other professional training; not a college certainly, yet affording to thousands all the general culture they obtain. It is all these: a school of peculiar freedom, combined with thorough discipline; of wide range and great flexibility in its adaptation to the educational wants of the young, yet having its own special aims which give it character; a school which awakens a greater desire for higher culture than any other in our school system.

We should fail of even a cursory survey of the academy, if we did not notice its character as a religious school. Here, however, we may speak very briefly. Three things only need be said. 1. Men will teach religion to their children. So long as there is any earnestness or sincerity in the convictions of a people concerning the being and character of God, the authority of conscience and the relation of human character to human destiny, they will teach what they believe to be the truth concerning these

things to those whose happiness is dearer to them than life itself. Indeed, the instruction of children will always be mingled with more or less of positive religious or irreligious instruction. Still more, children cannot be governed without a constant handling of their consciences. Just so long, therefore, as the men and women of a nation are not stark mad with infidelity, they will insist, for the sake of their children's happiness, and the well-being of the nation of which they are citizens, that the influences under which their children receive their intellectual training be positively religious,—that God be recognized by teachers; God's law acknowledged and inculcated, and religious obligation enforced upon the conscience. Much more than this may be desired by many, but this at least will be demanded by such a people as ours.

2. But it can be no function of the state to impart religious instruction so long as the religious convictions of the citizens are not substantially identical. Whatever moral instruction the public schools may give, therefore, must be given on principles of state policy, such as that the citizens should be instructed in the nature of moral obligation, and the rules of moral conduct between man and man. How far this principle will carry us in the teaching of morals in public schools may be uncertain. This much, however, is certain, that the religious instruction, and even the positive religious influence imparted in our public schools, must be reduced wellnigh to a minimum. Instruction in religion is not a function of the state.

3. The state, however, recognizes the right of individuals to associate for the purpose of teaching religion, and of course, therefore, of teaching science and litera-

ture religiously, provided in each case that they teach nothing detrimental to the welfare of the state. The state is even pledged to protect its citizens in such endeavors,—which fact is an acknowledgment in substance, not only that the establishment of such schools is the right of private citizens, but also their duty; a work which the state cannot perform, but which it expects them to do in their private associations and with a liberal hand, for the welfare of the state, as well as for the welfare of their children.

Here, therefore, we find again the sphere and work of the academy. It is the school where religion can enjoy its legitimate union with learning. Such schools will be required, therefore, so long as there are men and women in the world, of earnest religious convictions.

Much more might be said if there were time and space. Enough, however, has been said to show that there is a place and a work for academies of a high order. If we are to have colleges and liberally educated men, we must have academies considered as classical schools. The public schools have never met the demand in this respect, and will meet it still less in the future.

If an education above that of the public grammar schools and below that of the colleges is to be diffused throughout the country at large, we must have academies considered as literary and scientific institutions. If that sort of education in which religion has a positive influence is to be imparted to our youth, in view of the entire divorce of church and state in America, we must have academies under the general management of religious bodies. For these reasons we believe that our academies should be carefully fostered and liberally endowed. Let there be no jealousy of them on the part of those who labor in the public schools.

The state has its own part to perform in the work of education. But in a free republic, much will always remain for private enterprise to do. Neither should be remiss, if our system of education is to be complete.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. D. B. Hagar, Principal of the Salem Normal School, being called on to commence the discussion, declined at that time to speak, except to express his disagreement with some of the statements advanced in the paper; stating that he had great respect for some academies, but at the same time declaring that he did not believe they could take the place of high schools, or that they are equal to them for the general purposes of education.

Mr. A. P. Stone, Principal of the Portland High School, had heard but a small part of the paper; but he thought it unfortunate to have the question come up in such a way as to imply that there is any antagonism between academies and high schools. He did not care which prevailed, provided we had the best work. He said, I protest against the idea that there is necessarily any antagonism. In education there is a specific work to be done, and the question is, whether academies can do it better than the high schools, or not. I believe the day is past when academies can do the work that they did formerly. An academy in a small country village cannot support itself on a fair patronage. When we were boys and went to an academy, we used to pay for board \$1.50 per week, and \$3 or \$4 for tuition per quarter, and that was to support the academy. Now, when the expenses are trebled, the academy is not supported, and many academies are starving; yet I would not say

there should be no academies. There are some towns where a high school cannot be supported; a town of not more than 1,500 inhabitants cannot support a high school and pay a good salary. We shall always have academies and private schools. But since the introduction of high schools, there has been an improvement of all the schools by grading them, so that even in the small towns, where this is done, parents are too well satisfied with the instruction of their children to send them a great distance for the purpose of attending an academy.

In regard to the idea advanced that distinctive religious instruction can be better given in an academy, it seems to me that when we teachers have the spirit and enthusiasm that is demanded, and teach by the living voice more than by the book, we may make our schools what they should be, and at the same time be religious teachers, though not sectarian. I think we can do this work as well in the high school as in the academy; and we must remember that many of our academies can barely support themselves, and must go down; not because there is opposition to them, but for the same reason that the old spinning-wheel has been cut up for firewood, because there is a better way, and a cheaper, of doing the work.

Mr. D. N. Camp, of Connecticut, was happy to hear the statement that there should be no antagonism between the academy and the high school. Several years ago I believed that the public school system could meet all the wants of the schools of our State; but after a connection of more than twenty years with these schools, and seeing them in every department, I have become fully convinced that, in Connecticut at least, and in other portions of the country, the public school does not and

cannot meet all these wants. It seems to me the true idea should be to bring the best possible opportunities to every human being in every community, for the highest and truest and broadest culture. If our public schools will do it, let them do it. But I think our observation teaches that we should welcome the establishment and maintenance of academies and evening schools, as institutions that have a place, and should be fostered and encouraged. In our State, in many places, the high schools do not and cannot meet the wants of those who would secure a higher education; and, therefore, where academies are established and endowed, they should be encouraged. All the wants of the community should be ascertained, and then the best possible means should be employed to meet them.

I believe it is true that, in England, in some of the newer colleges, those who studied in evening classes attained as high positions and received the same honors as those who went through the college classes. I wish the colleges would open their doors to evening classes. In King's College, London, seven hundred students are in the evening classes. And while it was supposed when they were opened that only those would enter who would study what are called the practical studies, it has been found that quite as large a proportion enter for the pursuit of a classical education, and that those who study the languages proceed as rapidly in the evening classes as those who study in the day classes. A recent report shows that those boys and girls who attend only half the time, make equal progress with those who attend all day, if not greater; and at the same time this suggests an inquiry for us in regard to our entire system.

Mr. A. E. Winship thought the question to be con-

sidered was not whether academies are good, but whether they are doing more good than harm. It is of small importance to give a few a great education; the question is, what are we doing for the education of the poor, who have no means of educating themselves. Many towns have no high school, because there are academies in the way. The academies must be supported by men of property, for they find it easier to pay the tuition, than to take the trouble to establish a high school; and the poor have no opportunity to get the better education. If the academy were out of the way, then men of wealth would help establish and maintain a high school. When this has been done, the result has been good; for, having an opportunity to get the better education, the pupils of the poorer families have pursued their studies, and shown that they appreciated the privilege.

Rev. Daniel Leach explained that, in his previous remarks in regard to evening schools, he intended to have it understood that the cases of those who prepared for college were exceptional, as well as those of boys who made greater proficiency in their studies than those who attended the day schools all the time. He had no doubt that academies must be maintained in some places, as they are demanded, but not where a good, flourishing high school can be sustained. A good high school is to be preferred where it can be maintained vigorously; but where it cannot, if the friends of education would endow an academy and sustain it, it would be a great blessing to the cause of education.

Dr. Miner requested *Mr. Phipps*, who had so much acquaintance with the subject, from his official position as agent of the Mass. Board of Education, to state his views.

Mr. Phipps said, that the number of academies in Massachusetts was rapidly diminishing. There are in the State 176 high schools, 35 of which are in towns not required by law to maintain them. From very many of these high schools, young men can go to college as thoroughly fitted as from the very best classical institutions in our country. From several of the high schools of the State, the students are admitted at Cambridge without conditions, and that can be said of very few of the academic institutions in the State. Some high schools in the immediate vicinity of Boston are injured by the fact that the committee of Boston allow young men from the neighboring towns to pursue their classical studies in the Boston Latin School, without any tuition fee.

Rev. R. M. Sargent, of Princeton, thought that in proportion to population, there were more pupils who enter college from the small towns than from the cities. Some towns in New Hampshire, with a population of only three thousand, had sent more pupils to college than either of the cities of the State, with possibly one exception; and the reason was, there was an academy in the town. The academies must be continued for the purpose of giving the class of young men who desire to go to college an opportunity to do so, from the agricultural districts. In the cities, the ambition of the young men is rather to go into business, and those who go to the high schools are not so apt to wish to fit for college.

Mr. D. B. Hagar. I do not wish to make a speech against academies, because I believe that good, well-endowed academies are a benefit to the country. But if the question arises in a town, shall we establish an academy or a high school, my opinion would be decidedly

in favor of the public, free high school. The first eight or ten years of my life as a teacher were spent in teaching in academies, and for that length of time I was the principal of two or three academies, and learned the operation of these institutions, and the influence they had upon education in the neighborhood. Subsequently, having become a teacher of a high school, and a pretty careful observer of the lower grade of public schools, I came to the distinct opinion that, so far as my observations had extended, the evils arising from such academies as I had been acquainted with, were so serious as to lead me to question whether, upon the whole, they did not do more harm than good. Let me state some of the tendencies of academies. We all know very well how much aristocracy influences some persons, even in America; we all know that those who can and do educate their children at private schools, look down upon the public schools. Those people who had the means to pay for private education sent their children to me at the academy, and those who were unable to pay, sent their children to the public school. The consequence was, that the public school was looked down upon, and held in contempt; it was hardly considered respectable to send children to it. In this way the academy fostered a sort of aristocracy of education; and besides, so long as the sentiment of the wealthy class was in favor of the academy, they would pay the teachers of the public schools but a small salary, and of course such teachers had small qualifications. An academy is also very different from a public school in this respect, that it is not a graded school, and does not receive pupils from other schools on examination; it ordinarily receives them of any grade. I know that in New York they

received those who properly belonged in a primary school, as well as those fitting for college.

The value of the public school system depends very much on a proper gradation of scholars. We do not find in any public school Latin and Greek, and the teaching of the alphabet at the same time ; whereas, in the ordinary country academies, where they can support only one or two teachers, there is a great variety of studies, and consequently but a short time given to each recitation. A man who teaches everything, cannot teach as well as if he had but few branches to teach. I believe in a democracy of education, having the children of the rich and the poor families sitting side by side in school. (Applause.) If we wish to establish a true republican spirit, we must infuse it into our schools. So long as it is more respectable to go to a school where the parent pays for tuition, so long we tend to establish an aristocracy in education. We must have a system of education where all shall be put on a substantial equality.

In many instances, the existence of a feeble academy has been an injury to the whole neighborhood, since it stood right in the way of the establishment of a good high school. The high schools of Massachusetts are beyond question doing a work of immense value, and the proportion of boys who fit for college in them is becoming larger and larger year by year; and I think it is perfectly safe to say that boys who go from them to college are as thoroughly prepared as those who go from the best academies, and vastly better than those who go from the poorer ones. The town that cannot support a high school cannot support an academy by its own pupils; it must get them from abroad. Therefore the academy should not stand in the way of a good free high

school for all the pupils at home. If we wish to make education free, we must show by our acts that we believe there are no better schools than the public schools. Why can they not be made as good as any? Cannot we have as good teachers? Is not the public as rich as a few individuals? Whenever I see a high school take the place of an academy, I thank God and take courage. At the same time I believe in such institutions as those at Andover and Exeter. They are doing a specific work.

Mr. Richards approved of academies on account of their flexibility. He thought that a great proportion of the educated men of the country at the present time were educated in academies, and that those thus educated were more efficient as business men.

Rev. O. Chute, of Vineland, N. J., thought it well to consider how the academies came to be organized. Our public school system, half a century ago, had not reached its present state of perfection, and the public schools did not then attempt to prepare students for college. Then the academies did a noble work, demanded by the country. But the case is different to-day. The public schools of our country give as good an education as any academy. The system of academies is an effete one, not demanded by the present educational interests of the country. The number of men in active public life, who were educated in academies, has nothing to do with this question, because those men were educated before the present system of high schools was adopted; there were no other schools in which they could be educated but academies, that then did a good work. Fifty years hence there will be a different answer to the question. The academies formerly had, to use a Western expression, pre-empted the ground. I had the pleasure of being in close connec-

tion with the schools of Michigan for nine years, and I do not know that there are a dozen academies in the whole State, which has a most admirable system of public schools, almost every village having its graded schools, from the highest of which the young men go directly to the University of Michigan, as noble an institution as our land can boast. The high schools of any State can do the same thing. There are hundreds of high schools in Michigan and other Western States, where the education given is very much superior to that in ordinary academies. The money for the support of academies depends very much on the amount of catering done to the prejudice and ignorance of their patrons, but the high school is independent, thorough, and systematic.

THE PRUSSIAN SYSTEM OF COMMON SCHOOLS.

The next exercise was to have been by Rev. Mark Hopkins, D. D., President of Williams College; but owing to his absence, his place was supplied by Dr. J. C. Stockbridge, of Providence, who read a paper on "*The Prussian System of Common Schools.*"

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The afternoon session was opened by the reading of a paper by Rev. Andrew P. Peabody, D. D., of Harvard University, on "*The Bible in Common Schools.*" [This paper will be found in the latter part of the volume.]

DISCUSSION.

A discussion of the topic presented by Dr. Peabody was then had.

Mr. W. C. Collar, of Boston Highlands, offered the following resolution:—

"*Resolved*, that in the opinion of this association, the

public safety and the highest interests of education demand that the Bible should not be excluded from the Public Schools."

This resolution Mr. Collar sustained as follows:—

Mr. President:—When this question was proposed in the Committee of Arrangements, of which I have the honor to be a member, it was not my intention to take any part in this discussion. But as I have turned my attention to the subject more particularly since that time, I have been surprised to remark how often the real questions at issue have been quite missed; and it seemed to me that any one would have a right to be heard, if he deemed that he could bring forward reasons or suggestions that might assist the judgment of either party in this controversy. I say the essential issues have frequently been lost sight of. Protestantism and Catholicism have been arrayed against each other. It has been shown that the Bible is in danger; that the Christian religion is threatened with subversion; and finally that this movement for the exclusion of the Bible from our public schools proceeds from the Evil One. This last proposition I shall not venture to dispute. For aught I know, it may be entirely true; but I must confess the most absolute ignorance. It is a point on which I have not been able to gain any reliable information; and if I had, I should not deem it important to consider it at the present time. But irrelevant and injurious as are all appeals to prejudice, passion, and sectarian spirit, their influence with the unthinking is as undeniable as it is deplorable. For this reason, it seems to be doubly the duty of this Association to cast all the weight of its influence into the scale of reason; to assist, so far as it may, in holding the public mind to the real issues, and in securing, not merely

a right decision, but a decision upon right grounds. To me, sir, it seems that the most important consideration is that affecting the public safety. It is a familiar maxim that the safety of the state is the supreme law to which all others must yield. If it were otherwise, civil society could not exist. Now, the Roman Catholics declare that the use of the Bible in the public schools is an invasion of their rights of conscience. But granting that this plea is made in good faith; granting too, for the present, that it is true in fact; still, if it can be shown that the public good requires that the Bible be retained, they must be held to be conclusively answered, and their objection falls to the ground. To this point, then, I wish to ask your patient attention for a few minutes.

I shall assume, to begin with, what I think no one will deny, that some system of public education is needed in this country to insure the permanence and security of the state. Ignorance is the mother of vice, and vice is the deadly foe of public peace and order. But education does not mean solely the training of the intellect. For the purposes of civil society, it is far more important that men should be cultivated, more important that they should love mercy and do justice, than that they should know chemistry and conic sections. In fact, that training which ignores man's relations to his Maker and to his fellow-man does not deserve the name of education. Let me read Horace Mann's definition of education: "All intelligent thinkers upon the subject now utterly discard and repudiate the idea that reading and writing, with a knowledge of accounts, constitute education. The lowest claim which any intelligent man now prefers in its behalf is, that its domain extends over the threefold nature of man: over his body,

training it by the systematic and intelligent observance of those benign laws, which secure health, impart strength, and prolong life; over his intellect, invigorating the mind, replenishing it with knowledge, and cultivating all those tastes which are allied to virtue; and over his moral and religious susceptibilities also, dethroning selfishness, enthroning conscience, leading the affections outwardly in good-will toward man, and upward in gratitude and reverence to God."

On the necessity of moral and religious instruction there would seem to be but one opinion among civilized nations. It is said that since the third century of the Christian era it has not been neglected, and no state of Europe has failed to provide for such instruction for many hundred years. The history of educational legislation in our own country shows how essential religion and morality have always been considered to the welfare of the state, and what wise and careful provision has been made from an early period, that they should not be neglected in the public schools.

It will be sufficient for me to make two quotations; the first, from "the ordinance of 1784," reads as follows:—

"Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and to the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education should forever be encouraged."

The second is from the revised statutes of Massachusetts: "It shall be the duty of the President, professors, and tutors of the University of Cambridge, and of the several colleges, of all preceptors and teachers of academies, and of all other instructors of youth, to exert their best endeavors to impress on the minds of children and youth committed to their care and instruction, the

principles of *piety* and justice, and a sacred regard for truth ; love of their country, humanity and benevolence ; sobriety, industry and frugality ; chastity, moderation and temperance ; and those other virtues which are the ornament of human society, *and the basis upon which a republican constitution is founded* ; and it shall be the duty of such instructors to endeavor to lead their pupils, as their ages and capacities will admit, into a clear understanding of *the tendency of the above-mentioned virtues to preserve and perfect a republican constitution, and to secure the blessings of liberty*, as well as to promote their future happiness." Nor in legislative halls only do we find this idea embodied. I ask your permission to read in further illustration a few words from two most eminent statesmen. "Our ancestors," says Daniel Webster, "established this system of government on morality and religious sentiment. Moral habits they believe cannot safely be trusted to any other foundation than religious principles, nor any government be secure which is not supported by moral habits."

Count Bismarck, in a speech in the Prussian Chambers, used these emphatic words : "Without a religious foundation, the State is only an accidental aggregate of rights ; a bulwark against the king, a bulwark of all against all." But it may be said, "What has all this to do with the Bible in the public schools ? We grant that religion and morality are essential to good government. But the essential principles of morality can be taught without the Bible. Religious teaching even is not of necessity to be derived from the Bible." I answer, it is true that all morality is not contained in the Bible. It is true that the vital principles of

religion would exist, if there were no such book as the Bible. But something more is needed than a system of morals ; something more than an abstract statement of man's relations and duties to his Creator. You may find in Epictetus, and particularly in Marcus Aurelius, moral precepts equal to the best precepts of the Bible. I have sometimes carried into the school-room the meditations, or "Thoughts," as Mr. Long, his translator, calls them, of the Roman moralist, and read before my boys such passages as these : "Adorn thyself with simplicity and modesty, and with indifference towards the things which lie between virtue and vice. Love mankind. Follow God."

"The best way of avenging thyself is not to become like the wrong doer."

"When a man has done thee any wrong, immediately consider with what opinion about good and evil he has done wrong. For when thou hast seen this, thou wilt pity him, and wilt neither wonder nor be angry. For either thou thyself thinkest the same thing to be good that he does, or another thing of the same kind. It is thy duty then to pardon him."

But I have never imagined that this was enough; that the Meditations could be substituted for the New Testament,—the lonely musings jotted down in a military camp, for the Sermon on the Mount. Do you ask me why? I answer, "Because the one lacks the *sanctions* which carry the teachings of the other to the heart. Because abstract ethics will suffice only for the strongest souls—for sages and philosophers, if even for them. Because the mass of men and women cannot even be true to moral law, unless morality, in the fine phrase of Matthew Arnold, "be lighted up by religion." How

much less can children and youth. For the moral and religious instruction of such, the Bible is the best, I would almost say the only book. It almost seems as though many of the narratives and parables of the Bible were especially designed for children. "Where can a lesson of fraternity and equality be struck so deeply into the heart of a child as by the parable of Lazarus and Dives. How can the true nature and distinctions of charity be better expounded than by the parables of the widow who cast her mite into the treasury, and the woman with the alabaster box of precious ointment? Can the prodigal son, the unjust steward, the lost sheep, ever be forgotten?"

It appears, then, that we cannot do without the Bible, if we would instil into the minds of the rising generation those principles of religion and morality, which, in the language of the statute which I have quoted, "are the ornament of human society, and the basis on which a republican constitution is founded"; and that being established, individual rights of conscience cannot be pleaded against the public safety.

But let us look into this question of conscience a little. The Roman Catholic says: "My conscience tells me that the reading of the Bible by unanointed lips is a source of dangerous error." I reply, "Your conscience tells you no such thing. It is the Pope and the priest that tell you so." Conscience, if I understand it, is a moral faculty, an inward monitor that discerns right and wrong, something, in fact, of God quite different from hearsay. It is the voice, in the heart, and not the *dictum* of Pius IX. Your conscience tells you it is wrong to read the Bible, or even to hear it read by any one whom the Holy Catholic Church has not authorized! Suppose the Pope

should to-morrow in his wisdom declare that you might read the Bible, and even hear it read by a Protestant. Would not your conscience receive a most sudden and miraculous illumination? I respectfully submit that conscience is not a whim.

You tell me that the reading of the Bible, or hearing it read without explanation by a priest or other duly commissioned person, implies the right of private judgment; and that, you say, cannot be permitted. Now I ask, in the name of reason, if we are to give up the Bible because the reading of it in the public schools will give occasion for the exercise of faculties which are the gift of God? If there were not evidence that this plea is made in good faith, one would almost suspect it were intended as a jest. But it is no jesting matter. It implies a doctrine that has always been a distinctive one of the Catholic faith; that has proved a bitter and unrelenting foe to progress and to civil liberty; "a dreadful curse to the human race."

In deference, then, to this doctrine that "brands as a mortal sin a spirit of free inquiry, that deliberately inculcates as virtues many of the most deadly intellectual vices," that for centuries inflicted horrible tortures upon countless innocent victims, and filled Europe with blood by the most atrocious and damnable persecutions,—in deference to this doctrine; I say, which the mournful and warning voice of the past tells us has all but ruined noble nations, we, the sons of the Puritans, are asked to throw away our Bible! We will do it when the memory of Plymouth Rock and Bunker Hill has perished.

You offer us a sword to cut our own throats with. Doubtless we would do a good deal to oblige you; but

this is asking a trifle too much. Under the cry of "rights of conscience," we are asked to recognize and give validity to a principle which is at war with the very genius of a republic. To exclude the Bible from our public schools, and, worst of all, on such grounds as these, is not consistent with the public safety.

In ancient times, at periods of unusual danger, the Roman Senate was wont solemnly to decree "that the consuls should see that the Republic suffer no harm." We do not intrust the state to consul or dictator; but where all are sovereign and equal, the public safety is, in some sense, in the keeping of every good citizen. Let us see to it, then, that from this source the Republic suffer no harm.

We have thus far considered the interests of the state only; but I think it can be shown that the highest interests of *education* equally demand that the Bible should not be cast aside. When I consider what a debt the English language and English literature owe to our common version of the Bible, I confess this proposal seems to me almost a piece of educational vandalism. Allow me to quote a few words from Addison. "There is a certain coldness in the phrases of European languages, compared with the oriental forms of speech. The English tongue has received innumerable improvements from an infusion of Hebraisms, derived out of the practical passages of Holy Writ. They warm and animate our language, give it force and energy, and convey our thoughts in ardent and intense phrases. There is something in this kind of diction that often sets the mind in a flame, and makes our hearts burn within us." Consider how Bible words and phrases, references and allusions, are wrought into our daily speech. Indeed, to be

ignorant of the English Bible is to be ignorant of the English tongue. To know the Bible is to know at once the best, and the source of what is best, in the language. Considered as mere literature, what book could we so ill spare from our schools as the Bible? Where within the compass of a single volume will you meet with so much of simple beauty, of dramatic interest, of pathos and sublimity? The book of Job alone combines in a wonderful degree all these qualities; but it is the perfection of the sublime. Read the twenty-eighth chapter, and tell me if there is anything like it in ancient or modern literature.

The followers of Mahomet boldly challenge the admiration of the world for the Koran, the composition of which they declare exceeds the faculties of man; "but its loftiest strains," says Gibbon, "must yield to the sublime simplicity of the book of Job."

The scholars of every age have lamented the destruction of the great Alexandrian library, but who, if it were possible, would give the four Gospels, or the book of Genesis, or the prophecies of Isaiah, or the psalms of David, for all the learning of antiquity that perished by the torch of the caliph Omar?

There is one other point to which I can give but a single remark. I refer to the relation of the Bible to art. And I ask you to consider for a moment how much of the highest art would become meaningless to those who should grow up ignorant of the Bible. Pictures are among the appointed means of human culture, and of pictures the world's favorites are those whose subjects were taken from the Bible. I do not deny that there is an educational value in mere beauty of form and color, but will any one affirm that the chief value of art, as an

aid to culture, lies in what is addressed to the eye alone? Is it not far more in what it suggests to the mind, in its power to quicken the imagination, to elevate and chasten the feelings? But art to be impressive must be familiar, or at least intelligible. We pass with indifference, or glance with cold and unappreciative eye at a statue or painting, however beautiful in itself, if it is without significance to us; while we linger with long and earnest gaze at one that presents some person or event that has excited our interest or engaged our sympathies.

Imagine a Christian and a Pagan gazing upon the same canvas where some scene from Bible history, or some event in the life of our Saviour, is portrayed by the pencil of a West, or Rubens, or Rembrandt, or Guido, or Raphael — Moses receiving the Law, Christ in the Garden, the Last Supper, or the Transfiguration, — and fancy how different would be their thoughts and emotions! To the bodily eye there are the same figures, the same attitudes, the same groupings, the same tints, and lights and shadows; but to the eye of the mind how different! What visions of a wonderful past rise up before the one that are veiled to the other! What the one views with scarcely intelligent interest, conveys to the other a world of meaning. Where one sees only the form of man, the other beholds the Son of God.

What Christian parent, then, would suffer his child to grow up in ignorance of the Bible? What infidel or atheist would desire it?

G. E. Whittemore, of East Providence, said this question was a vital one with the people of his neighborhood. Admitting himself the full value of religious teaching, the question with him was whether instruction in schools could not be separated, as in the secular and religious

press, so as to have special schools for each class of instruction.

Rev. Mr. Chute would not yield to any in a sincere reverence for religious education; but this question of the reading of the Bible in the public school went down to the foundation principles of our national government; and while acknowledging our great indebtedness to the Bible, he must protest against the adoption of the resolution. If a family from the cultivated portion of New England should settle in Utah, they would not like to be compelled to have their children obliged to read and be instructed in the book of Mormon. The conscientious Jew or Roman Catholic has the same feeling in regard to having his child compelled to read the Bible. The state has no right to interfere with the conscience of any man in the state; but is bound to protect every man in the exercise of his own religion. But the state became sectarian and tyrannical when it compelled all to attend to certain religious exercises. It was adopting a state religion to compel all scholars in the public schools to read the Bible. There would be no necessary ignorance of the Bible in consequence of its banishment from the public schools, so long as there were churches and Sabbath schools earnestly engaged in teaching its truths.

No one wished to injure the public schools, but it was simply a question of the perfunctory reading of the Bible and the perfunctory prayer in the public schools, or of making our people more truly religious by a more systematic and reverential use of the Bible; the present mode of reading was formal, and often worse in its effect than a neglect to read at all. Children often had their consciences hardened instead of quickened by the process. The question was one that would agitate the Republic to

its foundation-stone; and the time would surely come when the reading of the Bible in the schools would be omitted. The Bible and Christianity need no support from the state; they will support themselves, as they are abundantly able to do.

M. C. Stebbins, of Springfield. I listened with great interest to the able and profound discussion which we had in the opening paper, by the Rev. Dr. Peabody. It was an unusually full discussion, reaching down through the layer of expediency, and planted on the solid rock of eternal principles. (Applause.)—I have listened with interest to what has since been said. But I have ceased to believe that we are now living in the days of inspired prophets. Therefore I lay very little stress upon the most positive declarations of any human being as to what will surely be in the future.

I will not waste one moment of the precious time of the Institute in trying to prove that all which the gentleman who has just taken his seat has declared will be, will not be; because I do not know anything about it. But I do believe we have no right to treat this as a question of mere expediency. As to the separation of secular from religious teaching, I do not know any definite line of separation. If any journal takes the ground that it will not have any religious teaching in it, it is too secular to be in my family, it is too secular to be accepted by me as a safe teacher, not only in morals, but in the great principles of the state. And if it be true that there is anywhere a religious journal that has nothing to say about questions of state, of education, etc., a religious journal that never undertakes to bring the two into close and vital connection, that journal is too impracticable for me. When our pilgrim fathers came from across the water,

and laid here the foundations of a republic, I do not believe they dreamed that any of their sons would ever rise up, and in their name protest against the use of the Bible in the public schools. If they could have seen so far into the future. I think they would have taken special pains to protest against any such person claiming such a fatherhood. The foundations of the state which our Puritan fathers laid were upon a corner-stone which they believed to be more solid, more broad than any other, and that corner-stone was the divine Scriptures. And those laws which we have that can be traced most directly to the principles of our forefathers, are just the laws which most distinctly and devoutly recognize the religious element in all our relations.

I cannot understand where the question of conscience legitimately comes in. What do men make of conscience? What is conscience? Is it that which says "I won't"? That definition answers more closely to the use that is made of it sometimes than any other I can give. We are the children of a divine Father, made in His image, controlled by His government; and I believe we cannot think right thoughts without recognizing our relations and our obligations to Him. That science which is emasculated of all religious elements is a godless science, an untrue science. If I were called upon, as a condition of holding a position as a teacher, to ignore the proper position of the Bible, I should regard it as denying God for the sake of my dinner, to comply with such a condition. In no New England State have the people gone so far as to recognize the plausibility even of such a plea as we have had for the banishment of the Bible from the schools. If we were to admit the correctness of such a plea, where is the stopping place? Has not the same

party just as good a right to object to the use of any text-book on chemistry or any natural science, that recognizes the fact that the laws of nature are not some abstruse, dry working of a machine, but the work of God through processes conducted by His Almighty hand? There is no place where we can stop, if the main point is once yielded. As to the case of the family in Utah, it is not a parallel one. Are we going to yield to such a plea as that, after we have founded this nation, which has had a history unlike that of any other on the globe, and which owes its grand distinction to the peculiarity of its universal religious teachings, and the permeating influence of this same blessed Bible? Are we ready to give up our position to those who come to us from the old, effete monarchies, and say, I want to come in, and you must therefore throw away your principles? If we are ready to take such a position as that, we should renounce all claim to the Divine care, out of which has grown so much prosperity, and cast in our lot with heathenism. Have we no culture, no piety, no reverence, and no gratitude to recognize our obligations to Him to whom we owe all we have? If not, we forfeit all title to any expectation of similar favors in the future.

Mr. John Kneeland. Before this question had assumed its present position, I came to the conclusion that it would be better, on the whole, if we did not attempt to make use of the Bible in the public schools. We are too much restricted by the laws of the State. We are simply permitted to read the Bible, any portion we may choose, but a single word of explanation or comment cannot be uttered. No matter if a word is used in a sense exactly opposite to its present signification, or if one wishes to show how it was that the body of the sick man

could be let down through the roof of the house, the law forbids a single word of explanation. Then, too, I saw that the reading of Scripture in school was done formally, not feelingly and lovingly. The scholars themselves were not interested in it. So my very love for the Bible led me to doubt the expediency of requiring it to be read in the public schools. I would not have the Bible forced upon any man, woman, or child; I love it too well. I do not believe we do the cause of Christianity any service by compelling teachers or scholars to read the Bible. If read, it should be read reverently and in a true spirit. I felt, therefore, that it was desirable there should be some change in the matter.

But the question of the use of the Bible in school, and the question of the exclusion of the Bible from the school, are two very different things; and I am sure no one can be more unwilling that the Bible should be excluded from our New England schools than am I. Yesterday I walked over the hill in Plymouth where the very first Puritans, Gov. Carver and others, were buried, and I cannot stand here and say in their name, exclude the Bible from the schools of New England. No; for if we consult history we shall find that the very schools which we so love and cherish came out of the Puritan love of the Bible. They wanted schools, that their children might learn to read the Bible. The schools were founded on the Bible, and it has been in them from that day to this; and I do not wish to see the day when it shall be excluded from them. I am willing to make every concession that can reasonably be demanded, but I hope for more and better use of the Bible, rather than less.

I do not think the merits of the question are actually

met when it is said we must exclude the Bible, because the Catholic denies it as a matter of conscience. Our New England States certainly rest upon a Christian foundation. The Bible has been recognized by both church and state from the beginning. They who join us come into a Bible country, and what advantages we offer them! In what nation on the earth can they receive the same? Is it fair in them to ask of us, who cheerfully welcome them to all these advantages, so great a sacrifice? I hope the day may never come when the Bible cannot be read in the public schools of Massachusetts. May it be more and more appreciated, and render better service, not only in the schools, but in the community.

Mr. Collar thought it impossible to separate the teaching in the public schools into secular and religious, by having separate schools. As to the perfunctory reading of the Bible, though it is possible, it is not more likely to be, perhaps, than perfunctory teaching of arithmetic or any other branch, that depends on the teacher.

Rev. Mr. Chute again spoke against the adoption of the resolution, at the same time repeating his love for the Bible. He thought the principle of the resolution opposed to the fundamental principles of republican government. But neither Catholics nor infidels would oppose the introduction of the Bible, except on the ground of religious teachings derived from it.

Mr. Kneeland explained that he did not favor the compulsory reading of the Bible, or the compulsory use of the Lord's Prayer, by teachers. Arithmetic may be taught in a perfunctory manner, and no harm done comparatively. A child may be taught that two and two are four, and his reception of the truth be not affected by the manner in which it is done. But it is not so in

teaching him, or reading to him, the Sermon on the Mount.

Geo. B. Emerson said that in every school, religious instruction should be given all the time; but sectarianism, theology, ought not to be given at all. Those great doctrines of immortality and accountability, the great parable of the talents, can be taught in no words so well as in the words of the Bible itself. These things relate to the religious nature of man, and should always be taught; but theology, sectarianism never. (Applause.)

Hon. Joseph White, in response to an inquiry in regard to the law of Massachusetts on the subject, said he was sorry to say that it is substantially as stated by Mr. Kneeland. The penalty, however, he said, facetiously, was only a smitten conscience for violating it. It was an outrage upon a great people to put such a law on the statute book; but there it stands! If I should attempt to point out the road where the poor man fell among thieves, or to give a pupil an idea of the height of Goliath, it would be a violation of the law, which says the Bible must be read without note or comment. Pardon me for a remark or two. The gentleman from New Jersey thought we must be careful how we crowd this question upon the community. Crowd it upon the community! Crowd the use of the Bible upon the community! Why, it has been the common law in the community from the time the first footsteps of the fathers were made on the shore of Plymouth, until this hour. It is not the statute law that puts the Bible into Massachusetts schools; it is the common law. And it was not till 1855, when there was a desperate effort to remove the Bible from the schools, that the present statute was enacted. Let us hear no more of an attempt to crowd the Bible upon the people.

Again, as to this matter of conscience, who are we? Are we Jews? Are we infidels? Are we Catholics? No, sir! we are a Christian people, such a people as God never sent forth, since Israel crossed the Red Sea. This nation is a Christian nation, and this State; and it acknowledges God in every step of its legislation; and now to turn round and say we ought not to teach Christianity here, what is that but turning our backs upon the fathers and upon God, who says he will punish the nations that forget Him? How the Bible shall be used, what shall be the spirit of the individual teacher, are questions for the conscience of the teacher, and perhaps of the committee who employ him. But the grand fact stands out that republican institutions are the outgrowth of Christianity, and never have existed, and never can exist, without the Bible. I thank God this question has to be met in my day. Mr. Josiah Quincy stated this matter exactly, when he said long ago, "There can be no freedom without morality; there can be no morality without religion; there can be no religion without Christianity; and there can be no Christianity without the Bible."

But really, it is not a question whether the Bible shall be used in the schools; it is a question whether there shall be any common schools. That underlies the whole of the movement to-day. Turn out the Bible, and then they will say they are godless schools; and you must confess that they are so, when you have turned out the very book that made them otherwise. When that is done, the country is divided up into little sectarian schools, a Congregational school here, a Presbyterian, a Baptist, a Catholic, or a Sandemanian school there, and the result is, no schools of any value at all; no union at

all, but sects, cliques, divisions, and death. No, sir, let us use God's word, let us teach those grand, fundamental principles of Christianity. We need not dwell upon points in regard to which we differ from each other. We stand on ground that cannot be shaken. We stand under the open cope of heaven, and shall we not teach God's word? I sympathize with words which I have quoted more than once on this subject, by Mr. Choate, that incomparable man, "We will not give up the Bible as long as there is enough of Plymouth Rock left to make a gun-flint of, or a powder dust to float in the air."

The vote was then taken on Mr. Collar's resolution, and it was passed by a very large vote, only two members rising in the negative.

The thanks of the Institute were presented to Dr. Peabody for his excellent paper, and a copy requested for publication.

The Committee on the Revision of the Constitution presented the Constitution in a new draft. Their report was accepted, and the Constitution as reported unanimously adopted.

In the evening, Dr. George B. Loring, of Salem, was listened to with much gratification on "Progress of Female Education, and Woman as an Educator."

THIRD AND LAST DAY.

FRIDAY, July 29.

The Institute met at nine o'clock, and was opened with prayer by Rev. C. V. Spear, of Pittsfield.

The first exercise was a paper by Prof. W. P. Atkinson, on "*A General Course of Study.*"

The following were the principal points made in Prof. Atkinson's paper: — that no course of study adapted to the real wants of American popular education has ever yet been elaborated; that this course, whenever it is framed, will furnish a well-proportioned whole, which, while it follows the precepts of a true psychology on the one hand, and adapts itself to the wants of the growing mind in every successive period of its development, and thus satisfies the demand of all true education that it shall furnish a real mental discipline, shall, on the other, equip its recipients with such an outfit of practically useful knowledge as they most need to encounter the labors and responsibilities of life in America and in the nineteenth century; that there is no real contradiction between the theoretical and the practical aim in education, and no such thing as two *kinds* of education, a higher and a lower, but only different stages in *one* process; that a system of free schools, therefore, and the course of study pursued therein, should form one topically constituent whole, from its lowest to its highest stages, beginning with the first rudiments of learning in the humblest primary school, and ending with the last results of knowledge in the free public university of the future; that so far from the interference of government being an accidental and temporary interference, to be confined to the early stages of instruction, and to cease even there when they can be better provided for, it is one of the very highest and most legitimate functions of the state to furnish a complete and liberal education to all its members, and that the true University of the future will not be the creature of sects or cliques, or classes, but a popular school and a state institution in as true a sense as the primary school of the present; that

the present narrow system of higher education, based upon the exclusive study of two dead languages, is the great hinderance to the formation of such a symmetrical system, inasmuch as it is the antiquated relic of a system of class education, and can never be refashioned so as to serve as the instrument of general popular education, but must sink into the position of a specialty; that at present, owing to the prevailing classical superstition, and the support it receives as one of the bulwarks of theological sectarianism, there is a break existing between our higher and our lower education which works to the detriment of both, leading in our schools, on the one hand, to an empty and pedantic training merely in Latin and Greek grammars on the part of a small minority of the pupils of one sex destined for college, on whom the greater part of the attention of teachers trained by the same methods is bestowed, and striking with barrenness the school course of the great remaining mass of pupils; so that for them the real outcome of the schools actually existing is the acquirement of the art of reading,—a result absurdly small in comparison with the outlay of time and money, and working great mischief to the mass of children, by depriving them of the real knowledge formerly acquired by apprenticeship, without furnishing them with any true equivalent; that the practical result is indifference to our public schools, and the taking away from them of the children at the earliest possible moment, in order that they may be put to the real teaching of actual life,—their literary education being thenceforward mainly carried on by the newspapers; that there is one and only one remedy for our present state of educational paralysis, namely, in such a reconstruction of our course of study, from the primary school upwards,

through the college and the scientific school, as shall make it one symmetrical whole, based on the two main pillars, first, of a *real* teaching of physical science, begun in the very primary school itself, and with all its earliest stages completed before the age of sixteen; and, secondly, a real training in language and literature, beginning (and with the mass of school pupils ending) with a real mastery of the mother tongue, and a real acquaintance with its literature; that, instead of these, there exist in our schools at present as a counterpart to the exclusive drill in Latin and Greek of college candidates, an equally dry, meagre, and unsuccessful training, — first, in the metaphysical abstraction of English grammar, and, secondly, in the abstractions of numbers; and that this state of things will only be altered by the bringing about of two reforms, first, the introduction of a healthier and better balanced course of study as a preparation for college and scientific school, and, secondly, the training of a generation of public school-teachers really competent to teach the rudiments of physical science, and really acquainted with English literature and their mother tongue.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. F. L. Capen hoped the time would soon come when there would be no controversy between science and the pulpit, and between the classics and literature, or the classics and science. He thought there was reason to complain of the time spent in the study of language in some schools. In the Latin School in Boston, five years were given to the minute details, in acquiring which the mind loses its natural elasticity and activity, and knowledge must be obtained ever afterwards in the same way, by those students.

Mr. Crosby thought that, according to one of the ideas of the author of the paper, it would be impossible to find anybody who knew how to learn or to teach anything. Is there anybody who can teach us anything?

Mr. Tolman, of Pittsfield, liked many of the ideas of the paper; but in his own teaching he thought he would have to apply them in homœopathic doses at first. He was born in Dorchester and attended school there; and he did not feel that a minute was lost in that school except what he himself wasted. The instruction there did amount to something. The defects which have existed in the past in many schools have been removed in many ways, by the spirit and labors of earnest teachers. Real literature and real science are needed more and more in teaching, even in primary schools; but our system is not so very imperfect as it was represented. There are good teachers now, and there will be better ones next year, and it is not quite correct to berate all that has been done for the last two hundred years. If many of the ideas of the paper are applied moderately, they may be valuable.

Rev. Mr. Chute was highly pleased with the very able and acute paper which, as he thought, instead of attempting to throw the slightest disrespect upon classical and mathematical studies, had simply shown the great importance of the other side of the question. Languages and mathematics were acknowledged to be useful in their place, while an attempt was made to show that sufficient prominence is not given to scientific studies. If we will remember how eager children are to ask questions and to learn about birds, beasts, and the heavens above us, and if we will take pains to teach them in regard to these subjects, and adopt some simple scientific studies in our

primary schools, we shall do much to develop the infant minds, and lead them through the mystery of nature up to nature's God.

Mr. Stebbins thought the gentleman who had presented the paper intended to give an edifying sense to those who listened to it, of what fools our fathers and mothers and their children have been. (Laughter.) The paper might be analyzed thus: treating of the following topics ; first, maledictions upon what has been and is ; second, some suggestions in regard to improved methods of teaching ; third, natural, and fourth, unnatural theology. The first part reminds us of the old story of the water and the fish occupying the same space at the same time, and warns us to inquire first whether the statements made in the paper are really facts.

If the state of our schools were as represented, and if the results were such and the character of our teachers were such, we might about as well give it up, and say there is no use in trying, there is no place to begin. But I do not believe at all that there is any such condition of things. I believe it will be found that any system that has had the serious, most constant, conscientious, and devoted labors of all the past generations, has in it a great deal of good sense ; and it certainly cannot be denied that the cause of education and our systems of education are the outgrowth of just such serious, thoughtful, benevolent, philanthropic work and thought. It may be that we are too well satisfied with what we have attained, that we think too little of the methods that we have been working ; and it is perfectly proper, and we ought to welcome suggestions as to means of improvement. But I do not believe the way to effect or to begin such a reform is with such wholesale and sweeping con-

demnation of all that has been and is. The tendency of such a policy is to shut up the mind and heart of those engaged in the work, and even to obstruct the truth that is presented. We are almost unanimously ready to say that the things stated are not true, that they are unjust and unappreciative, and that anybody who will present such views has little claim upon our sympathy, or belief in what may be good.

I did sympathize somewhat in the views presented in regard to grammar. The methods of teaching may doubtless be improved; but we cannot compass such a reform all at once by throwing up everything we have, and endeavoring to start entirely new. Reforms must be slow and the result of patient effort; and we may take a great deal of satisfaction in the progress actually made, and some satisfaction in our small part in what has been done. Let this nerve us to secure greater progress in the future. I think we should labor for a greater and greater attention to the natural sciences. But while doing that, let us not berate other things that have equal claims. The Latin and Greek are not to be ignored. The sciences can never be mastered until some knowledge of the languages is attained; and the thought, the skill that has resulted from the labors of the scholars of past generations are not worthless, they are to be recognized as a grand inheritance from the ages of the past. We are to use them thankfully, and instead of attempting to start *de novo*, to build on the foundations which our fathers laid, and be devoutly thankful that they laid them so well, and not spend our time in denouncing them, because they did not lay them better. Instead of cultivating in ourselves this spirit of universal iconoclasm, I would rather look around and see what wealth they

garnered in the past, and gather it into our treasury, and go on from that point working ever onward and upward.

Prof. Atkinson. The gentleman from Pittsfield, by his very kindly criticism, made me feel how difficult it is to speak of a system without speaking of the person engaged in carrying it out. I am myself a teacher, and it is the feeling of my own shortcoming, and of what I was deprived, and how poor my efforts must be in consequence of the system I was compelled to work under, that have given me the very strong feeling I have. I know how much life enthusiastic and faithful teachers put in the methods by which they work. I spoke of the system. Those who have criticised my paper have done it much in the same way that the old stage-coaches were defended, by pointing to the horses to show how elegant and how comfortable was the coach. That is very true; but no coachman can do as much as to beat the locomotive. We want to accommodate ourselves to the new wants of a new people. Lord Palmerston said dirt is only matter in the wrong place. So mathematics as taught in our schools are in the wrong place. All studies should be attended to in their time and place, and in due proportion. We must begin with the elements in the primary school, and go on, as the studies are needed, to the university.

I do not wish to decry Latin and Greek; I believe there is a place for them, and there always will be a place for them. In the university they will be pursued more and not less. Then there will be real scholars, and the boys will not have the Latin grammar crammed down their throats.

Rev. C. V. Spear, of Pittsfield, agreed with the views

of the reader of the paper, as presented in his remarks as now made, which he thought, however, were somewhat opposed to those of the paper itself. He had deplored for a long time the method of studying grammar, and thought much time was wasted in the technicalities of parsing. Language is to be learned by use. The natural sciences he thought vitally important to be introduced to children, though the study of grammar should not be to those so young. It is sheer folly to undertake to teach very young pupils the philosophy of language. But the natural sciences should have a place, even in the infant school. He rejoiced in the spirit of the paper, as it aimed to uproot the false theories and practices in teaching. The perceptive powers of the youthful mind have been ignored in the curriculum of our schools. There is no great antagonism between the spirit of the paper, and the views and practices of the best teachers.

Hon. Joseph White was very glad to hear Prof. Atkinson's paper, and agreed with the general views expressed by him; but, said he, I might not express my own views with the same forms of illustration. He finds giants sometimes where there are no giants. In our colleges there is a strong effort to introduce the various sciences, but the difficulty is to find the time for them. The remedy for that difficulty is so to arrange our course of study, that much which is now necessarily taught in college shall be taught before the pupil gets there. I fully agree with our friend in this matter. Let our children cultivate their powers of observation so that their eyes shall be as keen to notice the objects around them, as the eyes of Agassiz, if possible, so that when they see a little animal they can tell at once to what kingdom it

belongs. Facts and principles should be learned, but we should not attempt to introduce to the minds of children generalizations. I am as sick of that kind of object-teaching which has been illustrated sometimes at these meetings of the Institute, as Prof. Sanborn said he was; which illustrates objects by holding up a bit of glass, and commenting upon it. No, show simple facts in nature. Let teachers understand the facts which underlie the great principles of science, but not attempt to teach science from books at first. The young man who teaches a fact in natural history, is teaching his pupils to read, not books, but the works of God, in all his wisdom. If that is the new teaching, let us have it.

As to learning to read, it has been suggested that children must learn to read before they can learn anything else. As if they could not learn about a bug, until they had learned to *read* about a bug! Or, as if they could not learn to distinguish animals that have a backbone from those that have not, or the vertebrates from the invertebrates.

I agree that grammar, so called, is most difficult, in the way it was formerly taught; and I remember how I was taught that old definition of etymology by Murray; I went through his grammar, committing it to memory and parsed through Scott's lessons, and how much did I know? Nothing that was of any use in speaking or writing the language. But language is not so taught at present, and even the Latin and Greek are taught in a different manner. In this connection, an incident was related that occurred at Troy, N. Y., during the days of slavery. A runaway slave, who had been to Canada, had returned to Troy, and exhibited such a power of the use of language as to attract special attention, both in

regard to his choice of words and in his full, orotund utterance. Mr. White said, though I had been to college I could not use language as he did, not even the words I knew. I said to him, "My friend, how did you learn the language so well?" "Oh, sir, I was the slave of Massa Henry Clay, and I drove him all over the West when he was stumping, and I always taught the boys to talk as Massa Clay did." I would give more for what that man got from the voice of Henry Clay, than for the knowledge obtained from all the grammars ever made. The grammars of the English language are made on the pattern of the Latin and Greek grammar, and do not spring out of the principles of our language. How ludicrous to attempt to parse an expression that has come down from the old Anglo-Saxon! you might as well attempt to parse thunder and lightning. (Laughter.) You can say no more about it.

The studies of boys and girls should be in the order of development; they should be those that will best fit them for duty when they come into active life. We are a Democratic-Republican people; once or twice a year the destinies of the people are held between the thumb and finger of the voter. What shall be the character of the voter? Shall it be intelligent with reference to the object of the vote? Shall intelligence be one of the factors and an honest heart the other? Give us those, and the country is safe eternally.

Mr. Hagar. I wish to express my thanks to my friend for his excellent paper. I always express my pleasure, especially when I think differently from him. I agree that more of natural science should be taught in the schools; and that many of the facts of science can be taught in the primary schools I agree. A great re-

form is going on in this respect. There are many schools in which children are taught to appreciate the facts of science, and I hope the improvement in this direction will go on rapidly. And when our primary teachers will give the attention they should to this subject, they will find that they have time not only to teach all that they now do, but much that will be more pleasant still. It is a great mistake to suppose that there is no time.

In regard to the studies taught in our schools at present, I suppose I do not quite agree with my friend, Prof. Atkinson. What are the studies taught? We have arithmetic. Is it necessary or not? Is it a thing which the business of life requires? And when we take into account the fact that a vast majority of our children will not go beyond the district or grammar school, two questions come up: is arithmetic necessary? and will there be time to teach it thoroughly, if it is not commenced early? When we consider that there are so many studies that ought to be taught, I am inclined to think we can hardly begin it too early. The idea of numbers is the first idea that the child gets; and as he goes on, his ideas of numbers increase. This is natural, and being natural it is perfectly proper that these ideas should be developed. I admit that the mode of teaching has not been the correct one. It has been too abstract, while it should have been concrete. The multiplication table should not be taught by committing it to memory, but by building it up so that the child can see. It is as easy for a child to understand it, if correctly illustrated, as to understand any fact in science. It is as easy to understand that two threes make six, as that such a bug has such a name. And whatever a little child is capable of understanding may be properly taught. Much more might be done in

teaching reading ; too little attention is given to the thought, and too much to the words.

Take geography ; is it necessary that our young people should have a general acquaintance with the geography of the world, simply the political geography, to say nothing of the physical ? Should not a boy or girl of twelve have an intelligent general knowledge of the political and natural divisions of the world ? Of course, I protest against committing to memory an immense number of the names of cities and towns ; but a general knowledge of geography is necessary for every intelligent boy or girl, therefore we must adhere to our geography. Of course, every person needs to learn to spell correctly. And I believe in grammar ; I am old-fogy enough, conservative enough, notwithstanding the remarks made, to stand up and say I believe a great deal in English grammar as it is now taught. I will tell you why. Take, for instance, the analysis of an English sentence, and that is the important part of grammar now ; it is of great value. No intelligent teacher devotes much time to parsing ; but the analysis of sentences is one of the most useful practices, for it involves the whole subject of the thoughts and ideas expressed in the sentence. It is impossible for the mind to go through the proper analysis of a sentence without increasing its power. The power of classification is one of the chief benefits claimed for the study of science ; and the boy or girl who has acquired the powers of classifying well, has achieved one of the most important things. There is nothing in natural science that has more power to teach this than the classification of words and thoughts, as must be done in the analysis of language.

I admit that the study of language is somewhat ab-

abstract: but for that very reason it is valuable. Abstract reasoning is immensely valuable in all departments of study, and no child should go from our schools without having acquired considerable power in abstract analysis. I go as far as any one in favor of cultivating the senses; but better than that is the power of abstract analysis. And I maintain that there is no study in our schools so well adapted to develop this power of abstract analysis, as the study of language and the analysis of language; taking grammar in its best sense, and not merely parsing; although I believe in that. Therefore I stand as an advocate of the study of grammar.

In saying this I do not mean to say that grammar is ordinarily well taught; though it is better taught than some are disposed to admit, it may be improved. The trouble has been that teachers stop at the end of the analysis. But we should go further, and cultivate a taste for fine reading, for poetry; and there should be a great amount of attention paid from the earliest days of teaching, to the construction of sentences. It is one thing to pull sentences to pieces in analysis, and quite another thing to put them together in synthesis. A great deal of the latter sort of work should be done, so that as a child grows he shall acquire the power of correct expression.

Hon. Joseph White explained that he agreed as to the importance of the study of grammar; but he thought the time when it should be introduced into schools as a science was later than commonly practised. Grammar is a science, and it requires some maturity to be able to master the science. His idea was expressed in the language, "These ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone." He then related an incident that occurred in a primary school in Prussia, to show the

familiarity of the young children there with some of the fundamental principles of science. It is not esteemed undignified there for the king to visit a primary school; and one day when he made such a visit, he said to one little girl who had been reciting in natural history, taking a flower from his button hole, "My little daughter, to what kingdom does this belong?" — "To the vegetable kingdom." Then taking a guinea from his pocket, "To what does this belong, my daughter?" — "To the mineral kingdom." Then, pointing to himself, he asked, "To what kingdom do I belong?" Then, making a nice discrimination, instead of replying, as he supposed she would, "to the animal kingdom," she said, "to God's kingdom, sire." He said, with emotion, "I hope I may be permitted to belong to that kingdom." Such answers could not have been given by a child that had not been instructed in the manner of the Prussian schools.

Mr. Crosby defended *Lindley Murray* as a great benefactor, and related his own experience in the study of his grammar. Though he did not understand it when he committed it all to memory, "he got the jingle of it" in his head, and it was there still. Everything cannot be explained to a child, but the mind may be developed so that he can understand.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The first business of the afternoon was the choice of officers for the ensuing year, which resulted as follows:—

OFFICERS OF AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION FOR 1870.

President:— *Abner J. Phipps*, Medford, Mass.

Vice-Presidents:— *William Russell*, Lancaster, Mass.;

Henry Barnard, Hartford, Conn.; Ariel Parish, New Haven, Conn.; George B. Emerson, Boston, Mass.; Nathan Hedges, Newark, N. J.; Daniel Leach, Providence, R. I.; Zalmon Richards, Washington, D. C.; John W. Bulkley, Brooklyn, N. Y.; David N. Camp, New Britain, Conn.; John D. Philbrick, Boston, Mass.; Alpheus Crosby, Salem, Mass.; Ebenezer Hervey, New Bedford, Mass.; Henry E. Sawyer, Middletown, Conn.; D. B. Hagar, Salem, Mass.; A. P. Stone, Portland, Me.; John Kneeland, Boston, Mass.; B. G. Northrop, New Haven, Conn.; T. W. Valentine, Brooklyn, N. Y.; J. E. Littlefield, Bangor, Me.; Joseph White, Williamstown, Mass.; Charles Hammond, Monson, Mass.; Samuel S. Greene, Providence, R. I.; John W. Dickinson, Westfield, Mass.; Merrick Lyon, Providence, R. I.; Samuel W. Mason, Boston, Mass.; A. A. Miner, Boston, Mass.; Albert Harkness, Providence, R. I.; David Crosby, Nashua, N. H.; William P. Atkinson, Cambridge, Mass.; W. E. Sheldon, Waltham, Mass.; Geo. T. Littlefield, Charlestown, Mass.; J. P. Averill, Northampton, Mass.; Elbridge Smith, Boston, Mass.; F. E. Barrows, Hartford, Conn.; A. G. Boyden, Bridgewater, Mass.; Warren Johnson, Augusta, Me.; A. M. Payson, Portsmouth, N. H.; James S. Barrell, Lewiston, Me.; William C. Collar, Boston Highlands, Mass.; A. C. Hardy, Concord, N. H.

Recording Secretary: — D. W. Jones, Boston, Mass.

Assistant Recording Secretary: — C. O. Thompson, Worcester, Mass.

Treasurer: — George A. Walton, Westfield, Mass.

Counsellors: — A. P. Marble, Worcester, Mass.; George N. Bigelow, Brooklyn, N. Y.; M. G. Daniell, Boston Highlands, Mass.; W. A. Mowry, Providence, R. I.; N. A. Calkins, New York City; J. W. Webster, Boston,

Mass.; J. H. Twombly, Charlestown, Mass.; Homer B. Sprague, Brooklyn, N. Y.; J. N. Camp, Burlington, Vt.; T. W. Bicknell, Providence, R. I.; J. E. Edgerly, Manchester, N. H.; A. E. Winship, Bridgewater, Mass.

The President elect thanked the Institute for the honor conferred, — an honor which he gratefully appreciated. Though he would have preferred to have another chosen, he would not decline the position.

The next exercise was a paper by Hon. Joseph White, on "*Compulsory School Attendance.*"

Mr. White spoke in substance as follows: —

The question of school attendance, and that of school supervision, are the most important that meet us here in our own Commonwealth, whatever they may be in other States.

The rights and duties of the state were, so far as I know, first formally announced by the German reformer, Martin Luther. He promulgated the idea that one of the duties of the state was the education of the children. He said in 1526, "Government, as the natural guardian of all the young, has the right to compel the people to support schools." And again, "What is necessary to the well being of the states, that should be supplied by those who enjoy the privilege of such state." And further, "Nothing is more necessary than the training of those who are to come after us to bear rule." That is the doctrine of Luther.

What that training shall be is comprehensively defined by another great man, and a reformer in politics, the great republican, John Milton, who says, "I call a complete and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously, all the offices, both public and private, of peace and war."

That training which fits a man to perform justly and skilfully and magnanimously the great duties of public and private life, fits a man to be a citizen of a free state; and any thing less than that does not fit him for it. The great experiment which we, as a nation, are making, is whether we can maintain our free institutions. We acknowledge that we cannot maintain them unless there enter into the education of citizens, those elements which fit them to exercise their powers with ability, and to exercise them justly.

It will not now be denied that it is the duty of the state to provide the means of such an education. It is equally the duty of parents to avail themselves of those means; and I think we may go further and say that it is an undoubted prerogative of the state to *compel* parents and guardians of children to avail themselves of these privileges, on the ground that the state has the right to protect itself, and to see that the elements which compose it can be fitly joined together. It is not the chief duty of the state to act as a police officer; but to lend a helping hand to all enterprises and all institutions whose object is to increase its beauty, glory, and strength; in other words, its well-being.

Here the question arises, whether in so doing the rights of the parent are interfered with. The parent has duties and rights, and shall they be interfered with? Shall the conscience of the parent be interfered with; shall the pecuniary condition of the parent be interfered with; shall the right of the parent to shut the door of knowledge, and turn the key upon his children, be interfered with? I answer, yes. The parent has no *rights* by virtue of which he may shut out from his children the opportunities to gain the knowledge which fits them for

the duties of citizenship. What are the duties of the parent, and what are his rights? The first duty is to provide for the physical wants of his children. There is no civilized community that has not enacted laws to punish the parent who fails to provide for his children food and raiment, if he is competent to do it. Such laws are just laws. But this is not all; it is the business of the parent to supply his children with such intellectual training and such training in industrial pursuits as shall secure his independence and usefulness as a citizen. If that is the duty of the parent, it is the duty of the state to see that it is done. And this is the point which I wish to make: it is the duty of the parent to make over to society good material for its up-building; and if any class of parents fail to do this, society not only has the right, but it is bound in self-defence to interfere. Can there be any doubt as to these general principles? Is it not the right of the state to see that the children of the state are educated so as to fit them for usefulness, and, especially, to make them useful and valuable citizens?

Pardon me for an attempt to show in a few words what is the duty of this Commonwealth with reference to this special point of compulsory attendance upon the schools which we have. I wish to show that this doctrine which Luther enunciated, was early acknowledged by the Germanic States. As early as 1717, laws were passed compelling the attendance of children at school. Then these principles were first imbedded in the soil of Prussia. In 1809, after the battle which overthrew the Prussian power, and brought Prussia to the feet of Napoleon, there was a combination of all—king, nobles, and peasants—for the revival of their school system; and they went deliberately to work to make themselves

the best-educated people in the world, that they might stand up against the French power; and they are to test, perhaps to-day, perhaps within a week, the question whether they are competent to stand up against the robbers of Europe.

In Massachusetts we have acknowledged and expressed these principles in various forms. The first statute on our books — passed before those statutes which founded our common school system — expressly enunciates the right of the State to compel the attendance of children at school. In 1642 it was declared, —

“Forasmuch as the good education of children is of singular behoof and benefit to any commonwealth; and whereas many parents and masters are so indulgent and negligent of their duty in that kind, it is ordered, that ye chosen men appointed for managing the prudential affairs in the several precincts and quarters where they dwell, shall have a vigilant eye over their neighbors, to see, first, that none of them shall suffer so much barbarism in any of their families as not to endeavor by themselves or others, to teach their children and apprentices so much learning as may enable them to read perfectly the English tongue and a knowledge of the capital laws, upon penalty of twenty shillings for each neglect therein.”

There is the principle, there is the fact, that children and apprentices must be taught. All the statutes which we have that are worth much, have come from this and other statutes like it. In carrying out this early law, an order was passed for the appointment of a committee to pass from town to town, and report whether the children were educated, and how it was done. An interesting case is given by Mr. Barry in his history of Framingham.

The selectmen of Sudbury reported that, "having gone over the town from house to house and inspected and made inquiry, we do find that all children and young persons are in a *growing way*. As to reading and catechizing and as to work and employment, we find them generally diligent and in a hopeful and thriving way in all respects." Can that be said of Sudbury and other towns in Massachusetts to-day? But that is not all. They say that the school-dames are teaching, that Mr. Walker and others are teaching; "and touching such as live from under family government or after a dissolute and disorderly manner, the selectmen do return answer that they find none such among them." There may be a little puritan stiffness and stubbornness in such supervision as this, but such an order thoroughly executed now, would release the police courts and constables from much of their work.

To-day we have a law which recognizes the same principle, which requires that every parent shall cause his children between certain ages to attend school at least twelve weeks in the year; and, if it is not done, they are to be reported and prosecuted. We have also a law forbidding manufacturers to employ children who do not attend school at least twelve weeks in each year. Unfortunately these laws are not faithfully observed; still there are noble exceptions. In Fall River a school has been established which will accommodate two hundred and fifty of the thousand children who work in the mills; and by giving that number three months' instruction, and then sending them into the mills, the whole thousand are able to get their twelve weeks' schooling in the year. That arrangement is said to work admirably, not only as to the children, but as to the manufacturers. The children

are doing more and better work than ever before. At Indian Orchard, Springfield, under the auspices of the brother of Prof. Atkinson, they have established the half-time system. Children go into the mills half a day and into the schools half a day, so that half of them are in school and half in the mills at a time. In Salem they have a similar arrangement. We have also a truant law which is an effective one in about half the towns of the State. In the rural districts there is no particular need of such a law. In Prussia the schools are far in advance of us in respect to attendance, and in respect to the supervision of schools.

The children must attend school regularly, from the age of seven to fourteen. They can thus grade their schools better and secure a uniformity and a thoroughness in teaching, which we have not.

I would be glad to see long petitions to the legislature for a law requiring every town to keep the children between the ages of seven and fourteen in the schools while in session, except under peculiar circumstances; this is no interference with the rights of parents. A parent has no business, unless starving, and not even if starving on account of drunkenness, to keep his children from school. If he neglects to keep them there, it should be the business of the State to see that it is done.

In Massachusetts we only show 70 per cent of attendance of the children between five and fifteen. There is a dead loss of 30 per cent. The State expends money enough, and there are teachers enough, to educate the whole, as well as the seventy per cent. Would it not be a matter of satisfaction to know that the thirty per cent were added to the attendance upon our schools? We might then write on the great iron door of the State

institution at Charlestown, "*To Let.*" And Massachusetts would make such an advance in dignity and wealth and power as she has not made since the age of the puritans. (Applause.)

Several inquiries were made of Mr. White respecting the penalties for the violation of the present law of Massachusetts, and the best methods for enforcing attendance, which were answered satisfactorily.

DISCUSSION.

The Institute having voted to dispense with an evening meeting, the remaining hour of the afternoon was spent in promiscuous remarks upon any of the topics which had been the subject of discussion at previous sessions, or any others which the respective speakers might think it important to present.

Mr. Crosby spoke in favor of academies, and thought they supplied a want, by giving an opportunity for certain classes of persons to get a partial education, who could not obtain even that from the high schools, because they could not be admitted to them.

The President called the attention of the Institute to the fact that the Institute met in Worcester thirty-seven years ago, at which time Hon. Geo. B. Emerson was present, as he was also present on this occasion, as well as Mr. Valentine of New York, and called on Mr. Valentine to speak.

Mr. Valentine said he regretted, on one account, the absence of Prof. Greene, who had presided at the former session of this meeting, since he wished to remind him that thirty-five years ago and more, the Prof. and himself occupied the relation of teacher and pupil. I dare say, said Mr. Valentine, he found me a stupid scholar; but I can say most emphatically, that I found

my teacher was Greene. I was present at the meeting thirty-seven years ago, and I have looked around to see if I could recognize any who were present there. I did see Mr. Emerson, Mr. Salisbury, and John Milton Earle, then the editor of the *Daily Spy*, for which paper I have been a subscriber for nearly forty years. I had the privilege of calling the first county meeting of teachers, before there was any association. It seems a short time, to look back upon it; and yet, although I cannot call myself an old man, my father is here in the city at the age of eighty-three, holding an office under the city government. New York may be behind Massachusetts in some things; but she has done pretty well in regard to her schools. About half a million of dollars is raised in the city of New York, ostensibly for private schools; but it really goes to the support of the sectarian Catholic schools. In the city of Brooklyn, which is generally supposed to be settled by people from the East,—and many of them do come from across the sea,—there are no better friends of the schools than those very persons have hitherto been; and I am required, not simply permitted, but *required*, to read the Scripture daily in school. I believe there is more said about this matter than there need be. It is not our duty to cross a bridge till we come to it. The question of the Bible in the schools of Cincinnati has been settled correctly. I have always read the Bible and offered a short prayer at the opening of my school, and I have never heard a solitary complaint on that account. And if the question were submitted to my Catholic and Jewish friends, they would not vote against it. When this is done in an unsectarian spirit, few, if any, will complain.

This Institute has already accomplished a great

amount of good, and I hope we shall not let it flag in the future. Referring to the sudden death of Mr. Valentine, of Newton, he said he was a short time ago looking forward with pleasing anticipations of seeing him at this meeting. We are all rapidly passing away. Let us be faithful, that we may be accepted by the Great Teacher when our mission shall be ended.

Mr C. Allen, of Pennsylvania, said he had never met with this Institute before, but once. He came here now with a desire especially to hear the topic of the cultivation of a sense of honor among pupils, discussed. During the last year he had been investigating the subject, and was particularly interested in it, — because he had the care of one hundred and twenty of the orphans of Pennsylvania soldiers. The State takes all the orphans of soldiers, and educates them, and also feeds and clothes them. There are three thousand of them in homes established for them by the State, for that purpose.

We are perfecting our school system in that State, and are accomplishing as much perhaps as any State at the present time. The system includes several normal schools, and a new one is added almost every year. The city of Philadelphia has its own system of schools. The teachers of the State have discussed the question of compulsory education, and have petitioned the legislature for a law compelling parents to send their children to school.

The Institute was then adjourned in the usual manner by singing the Doxology.

THE BIBLE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

BY ANDREW P. PEABODY, D.D.

I HAVE in my library, under the date of 1677, a compend of geography, by one Peter Bertius, in which are given seven conclusive reasons why France and the French nation are worth more than all other lands and nations in the civilized world, taken collectively, and in which America is despatched in less than two pages. Suppose that a body of immigrant Frenchmen in New England, honestly agreeing with Bertius in his notions of comparative geography, had claimed the use of his geography or none in our common schools, would our fathers have even listened to a demand so preposterous? Would they not have maintained that they had no right to garble, distort, or suppress geography in deference to the ignorance or prejudice of their imported fellow-citizens; that it was their duty to provide for the teaching of what they supposed to be the truth as to the condition of the world, and of as much of that truth as the instructors could impart and the children profitably receive?

A demand, not unlike this in some of its aspects, is now made with regard to history, which

is a prominent branch of study in our common school system. We are asked to exclude from our schools the Bible, and, by parity of reasoning, all instruction drawn from, or relating to, the Bible. What is this, in the first place, but garbling and truncating history? There are important, momentous portions of the world's history, of which the Bible is the only manual. The Jewish people has exercised an influence on mankind, far exceeding that of all other ancient nations, and, outside of the Bible, how scanty and fragmentary is all that can be known or taught concerning this people! Christianity is the most important factor in the history of mankind. It has been the inspiration and the mould of modern civilization, and has supplied all the elements that distinguish it from the culture of the ancient world. It has modified all political and social institutions. It has given birth to philanthropy in its Protean forms. It has created home, with its unnumbered amenities and charities, while the classic languages have not a word that corresponds to our idea of home. It has reversed the scale of the virtues, attaching supreme importance to some that had not even a name, and throwing into the background others that arrogated to themselves the exclusive title of

virtue. Shall our children be forbidden to learn what Christianity is in its own universally acknowledged manual? Jesus Christ, whatever be his actual character, — whether he be or not, as I believe him to be, all that his biographers claim for him, — is, by far, the most influential personage that has ever appeared in the history of the world. To exclude his life and character from the narrative of human existence for the last nineteen centuries is an immeasurably more gross, foolish, and stupid mutilation of history, than it would be to omit the names and doings of Washington, Franklin, and Adams from American history. Shall not our children be permitted to learn what he was from the only authentic record of his person, words, and works? If history is to be one of our school studies, I know not how it is to be taught, if the Bible and its contents be excluded.

There are other departments of education in which the Bible is no less essential than in history. If moral philosophy is to be taught at all, I suppose that none would deny that it is distinctively Christian ethics in which our children are to be trained. I doubt whether the morals of Plato, or of Aristotle, or of Cicero, or even of Seneca, would come up to the demands

of our time, so far as the theory of morals is concerned, though, unfortunately, the practical standard on change, among public officials, and in our halls of legislation, is below that of respectable heathenism. But if Christian ethics be taught, shall they be taught as they are interpreted — and, it may be, distorted and misrepresented — by modern theorists, or as they fell from the lips, and are embodied in the life, of the divine Teacher?

Again, in our school education we are laying a constantly increasing stress on the culture of the taste and imagination in literature. We deem it of no little importance that our children and youth should become conversant with the best models of composition, should learn to admire what is truly grand, and to love what is truly beautiful, and should thus, both in their choice of books; and in their choice of words in speaking and writing, be under the guidance of a pure, refined, and cultivated taste. In this department, who will dare dispense with the Bible? Leaving their religious worth out of the account, in a purely literary point of view, I should feel myself bereaved of the choicest productions of human genius, of my highest inspiration and my most finished models, were you to blot out of

my knowledge the psalms of David, the parables of our Saviour, St. Paul's description of charity, his sublime chapter on the resurrection, the glorious visions of the Apocalypse, and many portions of sacred writ which transcend all other literature equally in the glow and fervor of their God-breathed thoughts, and in the sweetness, majesty, and grandeur of their diction.

This leads me to speak of a most important service that has been rendered by our English Bible. It is the chief reason why we can understand it now. It has been an anchor to the language, which, since it was published, has sustained less change than it previously sustained every fifty years. It arrested at the happiest stage the Normanizing or Latinizing process that had been going on for centuries before, and preserved for us the rugged force of those Anglo-Saxon words which were fast vanishing from popular use. Our Bible is still the key to the best English diction; and by conversance with it our children are made familiar with their own language, in a purer form than any other which can be placed before them. There can be no doubt that better English is spoken by the people at large in New England than anywhere else in the world; and there can be equally little

doubt that this is due to the fact that until now the Bible has helped form the diction of almost every child that has been educated at a New-England school.

In fine, the Bible enters, in some way or other, into nearly every department of education except the mathematical branches; and were we to admit that religion forms no proper part of school instruction, we cannot afford to dispense with the sacred volume in merely secular education.

But I am not prepared to admit that religious instruction and influence should be excluded from our schools. We are by profession a Christian people. We recognize the great principles of religion, of Christianity, in the devotional services in our legislatures and our courts of justice, and in the use of oaths in every department of public administration. Shall our children be trained as citizens, without the inculcation of those fundamental religious ideas, which will impress upon them the significance of prayer, and the dread solemnity of an oath?

Sectarian teaching should, indeed, be carefully excluded. But I know of only two ways of excluding it. You must either choose none but irreligious or non-religious teachers; or you must give your teachers a manual of religion that is

not sectarian. No sincerely religious man or woman will consent to take the charge of immortal beings at the forming period of character, without attempting in some way to exercise a religious influence upon them. If you deprive such teachers of the use of the Bible, they will, as a matter of conscience, impart their own religious ideas; that is, they will present religious truths in sectarian moulds. If you leave them the use of our Saviour's prayer and of his words of truth and love, they will readily keep their own peculiar notions in the background, in the confident hope that the sacred words will mean to their pupils what they themselves have derived from them.

The objection to the use of the Bible in our schools comes from infidels and Roman Catholics. Let us consider their case. As regards avowed infidels, they are a very small minority; and it is well known that many who do not believe in Christianity would gladly have their children educated as Christians, admit the purity and excellence of our Saviour's spirit and life, and regard the morality of the New Testament as the only system of ethics on which individual character can be worthily formed, and on which public order and virtue can rest securely. En-

tire unanimity of opinion cannot be expected with regard to any department of instruction other than mathematical. None would exclude moral philosophy from our schools ; yet it would be impossible to introduce any modern manual of ethics which would not find more dissentients than the ethics of the New Testament. There is not a school history that does not imply and teach political opinions adverse to the sincere beliefs of large portions of our citizens. The history of our late rebellion must necessarily have a place in our school-books in the lifetime of those who hold diametrically opposite opinions with regard to the conflict. If all subjects on which widely different beliefs are sincerely and earnestly maintained, were excluded from our schools, we should reduce our school education to the bare elements of reading, writing, and arithmetic. The only possible course is to use manuals in accordance with the prevalent belief, and to leave dissentients to private, personal influence over their children to modify that belief, if they regard it as injurious.

Moreover, no intelligent infidel will want his children to grow up in ignorance of the prevailing religion ; and as a man of this class, if consistent with himself, will send his children

neither to church nor to Sunday school, they will need the biblical instruction of the common school, for the outside knowledge of Christianity, requisite in and for the ordinary intercourse of daily life in an ostensibly Christian community.

But it is hardly necessary to dwell longer on the objections of this class of our people, who, I think, are generally intelligent enough to recognize the need of some knowledge of the Bible, and too confident of their own ability to neutralize Christian influence to fear—if, indeed, they do not desire—such influence for their children. I cannot learn that they have in any instance taken the initiative in opposing the use of the Bible in schools, though in Cincinnati, and perhaps elsewhere, they have been invited into counsel and confederacy by the Roman Catholics.

It is with the objections of the Roman Catholics that we are chiefly concerned. It is alleged, in the first place, that, as regards Romanists, ours is a sectarian version. This I deny. Our translation was not only made with no hostile reference to the dogmas of the Church of Rome, but was virtually made before any of these dogmas, except the Pope's supremacy, had been called in question by English ecclesiastics. The

earlier versions, prior to the adoption of Anti-Romanist opinions, were the basis of our present translation, and were seldom modified, except to change phraseology that had become obsolete, or to conform the English text to the more accurate knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek. James the First was more than half a Papist, and his translators were as far as possible from being representatives of rampant Puritanism. They were easy-going Erastians, who wanted to do their work honestly, but were inclined whenever they could, in accordance with the king's instructions, to retain the old ecclesiastical, that is, Romanist words, and of course ideas. So little had they of the leaven of Protestantism, that I doubt whether it would be possible to point out a single passage in which they can be accused of even an unconscious bias, still less of a voluntary wresting of the sacred text, against any Romanist dogma.

The only class of Christians that have any right to complain of our translation are the descendants of the Puritans, as against Romanists, and Romeward-tending Anglicans. There are several instances and ways in which, by retaining the old ecclesiastical words, our translators have made their version favor the Romish and Angli-

can notions of church-government, as — to take a single example — by sometimes using the term "bishop" to represent a word which they elsewhere rightly translate "overseer," — thus leaving the unlearned to suppose that there was a distinct order of bishops at Ephesus and in Crete; while every biblical scholar knows that the persons called "bishops" in the epistles to Timothy and Titus, are the same that in other parts of our translation are called "elders," that is, presbyters. But we, Congregationalists, deem the Bible so indispensable as a manual of instruction, and regard our common version as possessed of such preponderant merits, that we acquiesce in its use, while we are fully aware that it is unfair to us alone. Enlightened Roman Catholics admit that it is not unfair to them. Geddes, the most learned biblical scholar among the English Romanists, speaks of it as of all versions the most excellent for accuracy, fidelity, and the closest attention to the letter of the text. An influential native American priest, who was long a member of the school committee in one of our great cities, and took the lead in the attempt to exclude the Bible from the schools of that city, explained his position in nearly these words: "I admit that the English Bible is a perfectly

fair translation, and I think it far preferable to the Douay Bible; but our foreign ecclesiastics, and especially the authorities at Rome, cannot be induced to look upon it in this light, and could not fail to regard our acquiescence in its use as schismatic." Thus, in one case at least, we sustained a vehement assault on our institutions, and a serious inroad upon the public peace, solely to preserve appearances at Rome.

It has been urged that, if we insist on the use of the Bible in our schools, we should at least suffer the children of Romanists to use the Douay Bible. To this demand we reply, in the first place, that such an arrangement would introduce inextricable confusion into the schools, and, further, that it would be inapplicable in the many instances in which it is advisable that the Bible be read by the teacher, not by the pupils. Moreover, if our version be read at all in school, the children of Romanists would hear, if they did not read, the forbidden words; and hearing is fully as bad as reading.

Yet were our Bible an Anti-Romanist translation, or did it lie open to the suspicion of being so, and were the Douay Bible fit for school use, I would advocate its introduction so far as it might be found practicable. But the Douay

Bible is less admissible in its educational than in its religious uses. Its English is very poor. It often employs words and idioms that were never in good use, and are not easily understood. It is very deficient in its capacity to train the rhythmical ear and the rhetorical taste. Moreover, the Douay Bible does not even pretend to be a translation of the Scriptures. It is but a translation of a translation. It is simply a version of the Latin Vulgate, which all learned men admit to be itself a very poor and faulty translation, and of which one of the Popes has declared that it contains many dangerous errors. Probably there is not a Roman Catholic biblical scholar in England or America who would claim for the Douay Bible any value as a faithful representation of the original Hebrew and Greek of the Scriptures; and by introducing it into our schools, we should only stultify ourselves in the minds of those whose favor we should seek to propitiate.

But even were we to adopt the Douay Bible to the exclusion of our own, it would not meet the wishes of our Roman Catholic citizens, but would only smooth the way for new demands. They do not want neutrality, nor even religious books of their own choosing, in our public

schools. They do not want that we should concede their claims in the form in which they are now made. They are unwilling to have their children educated in our public schools; yet they want us to pay for their education. They are intensely unwilling to have their children under the tuition of any but Romanists. They desire none but religious teaching for their children, and will not be contented with secular schools. Their aim is the division of school funds throughout the country, and the appropriation, not of the small percentage which they contribute, but of the large percentage represented by their number, to the support of their own sectarian schools. Should this demand be granted, other sects stand ready to proffer similar claims, with equal show of right, and our whole common-school system will be broken up. The question virtually before us is not that of the use of the Bible in schools, but that of the permanence of our public schools as an institution. Several years ago I took the lead in the establishment of an evening school for ignorant adults, from which all religious instruction was carefully excluded. The Roman Catholics for whose benefit the school was established, very early withdrew from it at the dictation of

their priest, who said to me when I remonstrated with him, "Education is so great a boon that we are unwilling that our people should be indebted for it to heretics. We would rather have them utterly ignorant, than that their gratitude to Protestant teachers should make them look with favor on the religion of their teachers." Traces of the feeling thus candidly expressed may be found everywhere in the attitude of Romanists towards our schools. In Cincinnati, it is a notorious fact that the infidel leaders and the free religionists on one hand, and the Romanists on the other, have acted together under the agreement that, if the latter would render their aid in excluding the Bible from the schools, the former would give their votes and influence in behalf of special appropriations for sectarian schools. A similar purpose has betrayed itself in every community in which Romanism is strong enough to give promise of success.

The question really presented for our decision is, whether our common-school system is worth retaining. To this it would seem that republicans could give but one answer. With our endless diversity of sects, nationalities, and races, perpetually verging on antagonism and tending to dissilience, the only means of holding our peo-

ple united by any common ties of opinion, feeling, and interest must needs be sought in the education of each rising generation together, that thus by mutual association and attrition the impracticable, non-coalescing elements in the characters of the fathers may be smoothed and mollified in the children. Sectarian schools can only prolong, transmit, and intensify the dislikes, jealousies, and enmities which even now perpetually endanger our peace and threaten the stability of our Union. Some such schools will of course be sustained by extremists and zealots of various sects, and we cannot legally or rightfully interfere with them; nor under private munificence will a large proportion of any sect be thus trained. But the diversion of public funds for such an end is simply suicidal,—it is turning the arms of the state against itself,—drawing from its own treasury the means of its disintegration.

But it may be asked, in a free state will you compel children to pass through educational processes which their parents disapprove? Yes, I reply, unless their parents will give us ample indemnity against their becoming chargeable to the state as paupers or criminals, and will renounce in advance for them all claim to the rights

of citizens. Many of these parents have a chronic hydrophobia for their children, and honestly believe washing a dangerous and hurtful operation; yet who will deny the right — exercised in many public schools — of requiring of the pupils a standard of cleanliness and decency to which the parents have conscientious objections? The priests, as I have said, regard reading and writing as dangerous gifts at the hand of heretics; but shall we therefore commit our public interests to the keeping of a generation of wholly unlettered citizens? Now, in insisting on the use of the Bible in common schools, we simply put it on the same footing with washing, and reading, and writing, as an essential part of the training of the citizen. Without it, the citizen cannot know how the world goes, and why it goes. He is ignorant of the causes of many common things, of the springs of events, of the foundations of modern society, of the sources and reasons of many usages, customs, and laws, in fine, of much which it is imperatively necessary that he should know, in order to vote and act intelligently in public affairs, trusts, and duties. Our annual importations, and our absurdly easy terms of naturalization, give us as heavy a weight of ignorance and blindness as our

institutions, with all their elasticity, can sustain; and these institutions will surely and speedily succumb if the children of our imported citizens are left to their heritage of ignorance.

It may in this connection be worth our while to consider with how little show of right our Roman Catholic citizens can claim special appropriations from our school funds for their own sectarian uses; for this is manifestly the end at which they are aiming. They have, indeed, a population which might seem to proffer a strong claim, — a large minority in most of our towns and cities, a small majority, perhaps, in a few. But, in equity, their contributions to the public treasury ought to be taken into the account. The amount of taxes paid by them is absolutely very small; it is relatively much less, as compared with their actual property and earnings, than the assessments laid upon Protestants; and they furnish so overwhelmingly large a proportion of the paupers and criminals as nearly to balance — when we take into the account both direct costs, and forms of damage and detriment which admit of no precise estimate — the sums for which they might be credited. Their pecuniary claims for special appropriations are thus seen to be infinitesimally small.

But have they not, though a minority, positive rights as citizens? In one of our States there is a constitutional provision by which Roman Catholics are excluded from office, and that not on sectarian grounds, but because they owe and own allegiance to a foreign potentate. For the same valid reason they ought not to be permitted, without a solemn renunciation of such allegiance, to exercise the functions or enjoy the rights of citizens, especially now that the proclamation of the Pope's infallibility, with the admission that it extends to all things temporal which he may adjudge to have a bearing — however remote or incidental — on the church or religion, makes implicit obedience to him more than ever the primal duty. The non-allegiance of the subject to an heretical government, and the paramount authority of the church in any conflict of jurisdiction between church and state, have always been doctrines of Romanism, and have in many instances been acted upon. There cannot be the slightest doubt that a peremptory order from Rome might at any moment unite all the Romanists in this country in opposition, and even in open rebellion, against the government. If we require of our Southern citizens an oath of loyalty as an abjuration of a government dead

beyond all possibility of resurrection, there is immeasurably better reason for demanding of Roman Catholics, as a condition of citizenship, the abjuration of an authority still living, and holding a stronger grasp than ever on the consciences of its subjects.

I do not like to say it, but I doubt whether it is sufficiently considered that the demand for sectarian schools at the public expense — to which the demand for the exclusion of the Bible from public schools is but a preliminary step — comes chiefly from a class of our immigrant population that has shown itself insatiably encroaching, grasping, and usurping. I feel no antipathy against the Irish. I acknowledge their capacity, their genius. I forget not how many eminent men, in every department of literature and of active life, they have contributed to British fame. I commiserate them for their centuries of misrule and oppression, and rejoice that we can afford to them a home and open to them a career. But tyranny and misgovernment would be comparatively innocent if they did not exercise a malign influence on national character. They always generate a spirit of retaliation, a disposition to make reprisals, an unappeasable hunger for what has been unjustly withholden. The

Irish are determined to seize in the New World indemnity for their ages of depression and penury in the Old, and to rule with as strong a hand as they have suffered under. From whatever branch of industry they adopt, they succeeded in driving off native American competitors, and they are equally successful in establishing and maintaining in all departments under their control an enhanced rate of compensation. They have swept our factories almost clear of native help. They have nearly the monopoly of boot and shoe making, the most important and lucrative industry of our State. They are supreme in our families, and are enslaving us in our own houses. They regard the whole field of labor as their own, and stand ready to repel, by force, negroes, Chinese, — any rivals who may dispute possession with them. They are planting their colonies in many of the best localities in our towns and cities; and when they once get foothold in a neighborhood, there springs up forthwith a populous and fragrant Hibernia, which puts all native inhabitants to flight, no matter though it have been a chosen site of wealth, taste, and beauty. They are levying black-mail upon us, and are fast taking to themselves the lion's share of the actual earnings of productive industry.

They are sending immense sums to Ireland ; the rapidly growing capitals of our savings banks belong in very great part to them ; they have very heavy deposits in the hands of their priests ; and their ecclesiastical property is enormous, especially in our new western cities and on the Pacific coast, where the church (generally under Irish auspices) has anticipated other purchasers, and obtained at the outset corner-lots and other real estate yielding the most ample revenue, so that the Romish church often holds more property than all Protestant denominations, most of it, on one pretext or another, exempted from taxation, and a sure means of power, no less than of income.

The tendency of these things, constantly favored by the sycophancy of politicians and the subserviency of parties, is toward the establishment of an Irish empire in America ; and we may yet have to wage for our Anglo-Saxon liberties a war of emancipation, with fearful possibilities of success on the Celtic side. The demand which we are discussing deserves especial regard as one of a series of measures designed and adapted to create a foreign supremacy on our own soil, and to bring us under a politico-religious despotism which would be none the less

intolerable because under *quasi*-democratic auspices.

I have left myself little space to speak of the way in which the Bible should be used in schools. Of course, it should not be made a mere class-book, and should not be read indiscriminately. I would have it, in the first place, furnish the material for whatever devotional services there may be in the school. Such services are intrinsically proper, and, apart from their religious worth, they aid materially in the discipline of the school, by the relations of a more tender and sacred character which they create between teacher and pupils, and among the pupils. But prayer in the teacher's own words may be sectarian, or, what is fully as bad, may be suspected of being so. Far better is it, then, that prayer be offered in the comprehensive form given by our Saviour. To this, where it is found practicable, may be added the responsive reading of psalms and other appropriate passages of Scripture by teacher and pupils alternately, or of such scriptural liturgies of praise as might be prepared for that use. Where sacred music can be added, nothing could be easier, more pleasant to the ear and taste, or more edifying to the spiritual receptivity, than the chanting of psalms. Over and

above such devotional exercises it should be left to the discretion of committees and teachers, and should depend on the grade and character of the school, whether additional direct use be made of the sacred volume.

Where all or the major part of a school are of an age to profit by such reading, I would have short lessons read by the teacher or one of the scholars, embracing the most instructive biographies and historical narratives of the Old Testament, the choicest specimens of Hebrew poetry, the principal parables and discourses of our Saviour, the leading incidents in his life, and some select portions of the apostolic epistles. For such purposes there are volumes of extracts for school use, well chosen and arranged, and easily accessible, or the teacher may exercise his own taste and judgment in the selection.

But what I would chiefly contend for and urge is, that the teacher be not only permitted, but expected, instructed, and encouraged to make free use of the Bible for any and every purpose for which he may find it availing, — for instruction in history, literature, morals, and the fundamental truths of religion; that it be a reference book, a standard work, a recognized authority in the school; that as the teacher has recourse to

all other books within his reach for such help as they may furnish him in teaching, so should he have especial recourse to that exhaustless manual of knowledge, human and divine, for whatever knowledge and wisdom he can draw from it for the pupils under his charge.

The Bible has been civilized man's chief educator. Heaven forbid that under foreign dictation, and against the sound judgment of our people, we should take the retrograde steps now demanded of us towards the barbarism from which the Bible alone has rescued us.

CONSTITUTION.

[The following constitution was recommended by the Board of Directors as a substitute for the old one, and was unanimously adopted at the annual meeting in August, 1870.]

PREAMBLE.

We whose names are hereunto subjoined, pledging our zealous efforts to promote the cause of popular education, agree to adopt the following Constitution.

ARTICLE I.

Name and Object.

1. The society shall be known by the title of the American Institute of Instruction.

ARTICLE II.

Members.

1. Any person of good moral character, interested in the subject of education, may become a member of this Institute, by signing this Constitution, and paying a fee of one dollar.
2. Honorary members may be elected by the Institute on recommendation of two-thirds of the

Directors present at any stated meeting of the Board.

ARTICLE III.

Meetings.

1. The annual meeting of the Institute shall be held at such time and place as the Board of Directors shall appoint.
2. Special meetings may be called by the Directors.
3. Due notice of the meetings of the Institute shall be given in the public journals.

ARTICLE IV.

Officers.

The officers of the Institute shall be a PRESIDENT, VICE-PRESIDENTS, a SECRETARY, an ASSISTANT SECRETARY, a TREASURER, and twelve COUNSELLORS; all of whom shall constitute a Board of Directors.

2. The officers shall be elected annually by ballot, and shall continue in office till their successors shall be chosen.

ARTICLE V.

Duties of Officers.

1. The SECRETARY shall notify all meetings of the Institute and of the Board of Directors; and he shall keep a record of their transactions.

2. The TREASURER shall collect and receive all moneys of the Institute, and shall render an accurate statement of all his receipts and payments annually, and whenever called upon by the Board of Directors, to whom he shall give such bonds for the faithful performance of his duty, as they shall require. He shall make no payment, except by order of the finance committee of the Board.

3. The BOARD OF DIRECTORS shall devise and carry into execution such measures as may promote the general interests of the Institute; shall have charge of the property of the Institute; shall be authorized to publish its proceedings, and such papers relating to education as may seem to them desirable. They shall have power to fill all vacancies in their Board, from members of the Institute, and make BY-LAWS for its government.

4. STATED MEETINGS of the Board shall be held on the first Saturday in January, and on the first day of the annual meeting of the Institute.

ARTICLE VI.

By-Laws and Amendments.

1. BY-LAWS not repugnant to this Constitution may be adopted at any regular meeting.

2. This Constitution may be ALTERED or AMENDED by a vote of two-thirds of the members present at the annual meeting, provided two-thirds of the Directors present at a stated meeting, shall agree to recommend the proposed alteration or amendment.

BY-LAWS.

1. At all meetings of the Board of Directors, seven members shall be necessary to constitute a QUORUM to do business.

2. The Board of Directors shall annually choose a COMMITTEE OF FINANCE, whose duty it shall be to audit the accounts of the Treasurer, and, under control of the Board of Directors, to draw orders on the Treasurer for the payment of charges against the Institute.

3. It shall be the duty of the SECRETARY, on application of any two Directors, to call special meetings of the Board at such time and place as the President may appoint.

4. The Board of Directors shall be empowered at any stated meeting, to vote an annual assessment upon the members of the Institute, and all persons paying the assessment shall be entitled to a copy of the proceedings for that year.

Pro. Proc.
V. due.

OK

00

P

OK

t

OL

al St

aa St

e.
e.